Fall 12-18-2013

Negotiating the Faculty Journey: Technology, Teaching, and Tenure

Joseph Horne

NEGOTIATING THE FACULTY JOURNEY: TECHNOLOGY, TEACHING, AND TENURE

by

Joe Horne

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the
Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Instructional Technology
in
The Department of Learning Technologies
in
The College of Education
Georgia State University

Atlanta, Georgia
2013

ACCEPTANCE

This dissertation, NEGOTIATING THE FACULTY JOURNEY: TECHNOLOGY, TEACHING, AND TENURE by JOSEPH PERRY HORNE, JR., was prepared under the direction of the candidate's Dissertation Advisory Committee. It is accepted by the committee members in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in the College of Education, Georgia State University. The Dissertation Advisory Committee and the student's Department Chair, as representatives of the faculty, certify that this dissertation has met all standards of excellence and scholarship as determined by the faculty. The Dean of the College of Education concurs.

_____
Brendan Calandra, Ph.D.
Committee Chair

_____
Stephen W. Harmon, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Laurie Dias, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Jennifer Esposito, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Date

_____
Stephen Harmon, Ph.D.
Chair, Division of Learning Technologies

_____
Paul A. Alberto, Ph.D.
Interim Dean
College of Education

AUTHOR'S STATEMENT

By presenting this dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the advanced degree from Georgia State University, I agree that the library of Georgia State University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to quote, to copy from, or to publish this dissertation may be granted by the professor under whose direction it was written, by the College of Education's director of graduate studies and research, or by me. Such quoting, copying, or publishing must be solely for scholarly purposes and will not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from or publication of this dissertation which involves potential financial gain will not be allowed without my written permission.

_____

Joseph Perry Horne, Jr.

NOTICE TO BORROWERS

All dissertations deposited in the Georgia State University library must be used in accordance with the stipulations prescribed by the author in the preceding statement. The author of this dissertation is:

Joseph Perry Horne, Jr.
3955 Bigelow Blvd, Apt 803
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

The director of this dissertation is:

Dr. Brendan Calandra
Division of Learning Technologies
College of Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30307 – 2057

VITAE

Joseph Horne
3955 Bigelow Blvd., Apt 803
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Educational Background

Ph.D.	Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA Major: Instructional Technology Dissertation: Negotiating the Faculty Journey: Technology, Teaching, and Tenure	2013
M.S.	Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA Major: Instructional Technology	2008
B.M.	University of Montevallo, Montevallo, AL Major: Piano Pedagogy	1993

Relevant Technology Training

NVivio 8 - 10 (QSR International)
Adobe Creative Suite & Final Cut Studio (Digital Media Academy @ Stanford University)

Professional Experience

2013	Director, Instructional Services The University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA
2009 – 2013	Manager, Instructional Design, Information Systems and Technology Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA
2008 – 2009	Technology Instructor and Coordinator The Galloway School, Atlanta, GA
2007 – 2008	Manager, Instructional Design & Technology ChoicePoint/LexisNexis, Alpharetta, GA
1998 – 2007	Senior Instructional Designer, eLearning Developer & Trainer MATRIX Resources, Atlanta, GA
1996 – 1998	Senior Associate (Consultant) Coopers & Lybrand/PriceWaterhouseCoopers, Atlanta, GA
1993 – 1996	Junior Project Manager IBM, Birmingham, AL & Atlanta, GA

Courses Taught
IT2010 – Undergraduate technology course (online)

1010 – Freshmen Orientation course on the intersection of the environment and technology

1010 – Freshmen Orientation course focused on constructing rich media

Presentations

Allen, J., J. Horne, & P. Nolde. (2012) You can get there from here: Strategies for planning academic iPad initiatives. Preconference Seminar. ELI Learning Initiative. Austin, TX.

Horne, J. (2012). Disappearing Act: A short queer history of higher education. SHOES (Southern History of Education) Florida State University. Tallahassee, FL.

Horne, J. (2011) Data as lyrics: Love songs for faculty. 3rd International Symposium on Poetic Inquiry. Bournemouth University, UK.

Horne, J. (2011). Freshmen, iPads and flip cameras: Lessons learned in the mobile landscape. SALT (Society of Applied Learning Technologies). Featured Speaker. Orlando, FL

Horne, J. (2011). Love songs for faculty: Songwriting and narrative data in arts-based inquiry. 17th Annual Midwest Qualitative Research Conference. St. Thomas University. Minneapolis, MN.

Horne, J. (2011). Mobile technology: You should get out more often. Ecopedagogy, Composition, and Fieldwork. With Ellison, A. and Honold, R. Indiana University.

Alonso, J., R. Blair, J. Horne, & P. Kenyon. (2011) Panel: The future of mobile learning: Panel discussion by experts in the areas of mobile learning, Mobile Testing and Mobile Surveys. SALT (Society of Applied Learning Technologies). Orlando, FL.

Horne, J. (2010) Animating ethics: Using web 2.0 to challenge the undergraduate. Poster Session. Campus Technology Conference. Boston, MA.

Positions
2011- 2012. President-elect, GrITs (Graduates in Instructional Technology)
2010, 2011, 2012. Voting Member, Georgia State University Tech Fee Committee

Professional Organizations

ISTE (International Society for Technology in Education)
AECT (Association for Educational Technology and Communication
APA (American Psychology Association)
Educause
ASLE (American Society for Literature and the Environment)

ABSTRACT

NEGOTIATING THE FACULTY JOURNEY: TECHNOLOGY, TEACHING, AND TENURE
by

Joe Horne

This phenomenological study examined the lived experience of five (5) tenured university faculty members over a ten-year span of their professional lives. The purpose of this study was to better understand the lived experience of tenured university faculty, particularly how they negotiated experiences related to the combined influences of technology, tenure, and teaching. While some have suggested that university faculty do not have the necessary skills to transition to this emerging technological era (McKee & Tew, 2013), this study did not attempt to make judgments about whether or not college faculty were prepared to shift their approach to teaching, nor whether such a shift was even necessary. Instead, the study was guided by the following questions: *How did a group of tenured faculty negotiate which technologies entered their work and home life?*; and *How did factors inside and outside of the university shape this experience?* Results suggested that technology changed only minor aspects of what it meant to be tenured faculty in higher education; however, the changes and the extent of the changes varied from person to person. This study suggested that factors such as gender, university administration, tenure and the tenure process, and home life played a larger role in the lifeworlds of these faculty. This study adds to the literature on how technology influences university faculty, but it also provides insight to those in higher education charged with supporting faculty use of technology (i.e., instructional designers, technology support staff).

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my committee for their willingness to help me on my journey. All of my committee members have worked with me from the start of my journey through graduate school; remarkably, they did not give up on me.

Thank you to my fellow graduate students who have offered support, advice, and inspiration, especially Roxanne Russell, David Stone, Shabana Figeuroa, Winnie Kosma, Dana Bryant, Julian Allen, and Linda Sun. Thanks to my many colleagues, especially Johanna Asmuss, Bryn Richardson, Zoe Salloom, Monique McGee, Jon Weaver, and Jamie Bernhardt. Thanks to my colleagues at The University of Pittsburgh who have been so encouraging and supportive since my arrival, especially Cynthia Golden, Mike Arenth, Lorna Kearns, Joe Cornibe, and Carol Washburn.

Thanks to Dianne Gholden, David Hagan, The Labountys and the bicycle gang. Thanks to Jodi Kaufmann who helped me to open my writing.

I also want to thank my sisters, Jeanette and Teresa, and my brothers, Hobert and James, and my cat, Baker. Thanks to my Mom and Dad – I wish you both could have shared this moment with me.

Finally, I cannot show enough appreciation to the faculty who participated in this study. Given the demands made on your time, each of you still agreed to help me with this study. It was almost like having a secondary committee for this dissertation. Thank you for opening your life to me, and for letting me write about you and your experience. I hope I have represented you fairly, accurately, and kindly.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter One

Introduction

> The forgetfulness, loss, and oblivion of being is a phenomenon that permeates the planet in close relation to the dominance of manipulative, technological thinking, but it permeates the behavioral sciences as demonstrated by their overlooking man's being-awake and being-there, by their omission of human being.
>
> (Vandenberg, 1971),p.9

Problem Statement

This study took place in a time of technology-driven change (Introna, 2011). Faster, smaller, more powerful technologies were available with each passing month at a cost so modest that most devices were easily available to large portions of the US population (Block, 2004; Compaine, 2001). These ever-emerging technologies created an environment of always-moving, always-shifting space (Postman, 1993). Elements of unpredictability and change were constant. These changes sometimes created a complicated, uneven space of ungroundedness in higher education, and not everyone believed this encompassing globalization and 'technification' of our learning environments was a good thing (Burniske, 2001). How did tenured college faculty experience these technology driven changes?

Despite arguments against the introduction of more technology into the learning space (Lei, 2010; Oppenheimer, 2003; Postman, 1993, 1996; Wieder, 2011), the 2000s saw an influx of new educational technologies. Though not everyone agreed that spending

capital on educational technology was useful (Boyles, 2011), universities continued to invest in technology. Students often paid for these expenditures in the form of increased fees (Young, 1997). Despite the spending on technology, there was no evident improvement in learning outcomes (Richtel, 2011). Much research looked at whether technologies improved learning outcomes; however, surprisingly little research had been done on how faculty experienced or approached these technologies. The guidance provided to faculty by instructional designers and instructional technologists had sometimes been inadequate because they frequently did not understand the complicated experience of faculty, and how that experience influenced faculty instructional choices. Much thought had been given to how technologies might improve student engagement (Manuguerra & Petocz, 2011), but little attention had been paid to how these technologies shaped, altered, or realigned faculty and student interactions (Hewitt & Forte, 2006), or to teacher perspectives of how these technologies changed what it meant to teach (Baldwin, 1998). Especially little attention has been paid to the faculty members' lived experience with technology – their perception of what technology meant to their profession, how the technology changed what they did, and what it meant to their personal lives.

Faculty have been and continue to be impacted by technological changes (Sappey & Relf, 2010), are expected to know how to manage technology in their classes, and, in some cases, to provide technical support for their students (Albright, 1996). The myth of 'digital natives' and 'digital immigrants' (Prensky, 2006) has been abandoned as we come to grips with how complicated an understanding of the experience of technology can be (Hoffman & Vance, 2005). This study hopes to bring some clarity to the faculty

experience with the changing trends in technology. Instructional technologists do not always understand how faculty adapt to and negotiate technology. While Baldwin's (1998) study on the impact of technology on faculty's professional and personal life is valuable, much has changed since 1998. Our lack of understanding about more recent faculty experience with technology has hindered the ability of IDT professionals to assist faculty with instructional technology. This phenomenological study provided insight into how IDT professionals might take some small steps towards alleviating this problem by looking at the bigger picture of faculty experience.

Technology has changed nearly every aspect of our lives (Lyotard, 1984). Sometimes the changes brought on by technology happened so rapidly, experiences were difficult to examine or understand (Adams, 2010). With phenomenology, one tries to make sense of how someone else makes sense of a particular experience. I attempted to get as close to the faculty experience as possible in this study.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of my study was to better understand the lived experience of university faculty, particularly how they negotiated experiences related to the combined influences of technology, tenure, and teaching. While researchers in the field of Instructional Design and Technology have spent years focusing on technology integration in teaching (Bates & Poole, 2003; Dexter & Riedel, 2003; Graham, Culatta, Pratt, & West, 2004), there has been little discussion of how these technologies altered or shaped faculty experience or how faculty negotiated this experience. While many societal forces affected faculty in the past decade, this study focused on how faculty experienced and made choices about technology. My study focused on tenured university faculty who

were best able to articulate their unique lived experience. Some of these experiences blurred the lines that separated their professional and personal lives. My study dug into these deep, rich spaces where the faculty experience of technology, teaching, and tenure intersected and overlapped. While some have suggested that university faculty do not have the necessary skills to transition to this emerging technological era (McKee & Tew, 2013), this study did not attempt to make judgments about whether or not college faculty were prepared to shift their approach to teaching, nor whether such a shift was even necessary. Instead, my primary research questions were:

1. How did a group of tenured faculty negotiate which technologies entered their work and home life?
2. How did factors inside and outside of the university shape this experience?

Terms and Definitions

In this section, I offer definitions for some of the more common terms used in this manuscript. Many of these terms are described in greater detail throughout the document, and I define them in the context of this specific study.

- Bracketing – The practice of separating out or filtering bias, assumptions, and preconceived notions of experience and meaning in an effort to better understand the essence of something.
- Constructivism – A theory of learning that suggests learners construct their own learning, often through direct experience, but also through mental models unique to their person.
- *Dasein* – "There-being." A German phenomenological expression that ontologically addresses the beingness of humans.

- Disruptive innovation – An innovation that has far reaching consequences for a well-established way of doing things, often reshaping an entire experience or way of life in radical and unexpected ways.
- Eidetic – The essence or essences of human experience.
- Epoche – Suspending our beliefs and seeing only what appears before our eyes.
- Existentialism – A philosophy that suggests that people are shaped by their anxieties and are capable of making their own decisions.
- Faculty – Those who teach at the university in this study
- Higher Education – A broad term used to refer to colleges and universities
- Instructional Design and Technology – A broad and diverse field of researchers and practitioners who practice instructional design in educational, non-profit and corporate environments to communicate information, improve learning outcomes, and introduce innovations.
- Intentionality – The focusing of our attention on a particular person, thing, or experience.
- Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis – An interpretive approach to phenomenological research that attempts to shed light on how a person or group experiences a particular phenomenon.
- Intersubjectivity – Relating a common experience among several people, often seen as a way of relating.
- Lifeworld – The space in which one experiences their life and humanness.
- Mobile technology – Small, portable technologies (iPads and flip cameras, for example) that allow users to create and share content with others.

- Noema – An object upon which we focus our consciousness.
- Noesis – An experience involving our consciousness.
- Phenomenology – A conscious and reflective examination, description and interpretation of lived experience.
- Ubiquitous technology – For this study, an all-encompassing term used to describe technologies like e-mail, PowerPoint, iPads, smart phones, databases, Excel, and the Internet in a way to represent the vastness of technology in the everyday experience of participants.

Limitations

Gadamer (2004) suggested that traditional empirical science is mechanical, based on a series of artificially imposed effects that would not occur in the natural everyday life of human beings. In some fields, such as psychology, phenomenology is sometimes dismissed from the canon of scientifically conducted research simply because it is qualitative (Applebaum, 2012). The arguments between the importance, validity, and quality of human versus natural science have been ongoing. I aligned myself with the human sciences, specifically the human science of phenomenology. Husserl, who started out as a natural scientist, critiqued the dislocated context of much natural science (Husserl, 1975). Sartre and many others continued this critique (Sartre & Elkaim-Sartre, 2004). None said that natural science efforts do not contribute to our knowledge and understanding of the world, only that those sciences are limited in what they can do. Phenomenology is also limited. Our preconceived notions of science and 'the scientific' are always changing in light of new discoveries. Phenomenology operates systematically, and does not necessarily verify a scientific principle, but works instead to make a

discovery of some kind. These discoveries may occur and be presented in surprising ways -- including through visual and literary art, which are also ways of knowing (Allen, 1995; Given, 2008). Intersections of art and science are not uncommon, and I hope the reader will welcome their collaboration here. Regardless of the revelations that come through the melding of science and art, a complete phenomenological penetration of an individual experience is not possible in any study, as the individual lives in a certain place of solitude that can never be completely, holistically understood, despite the depth of research (Koch, 1994).

I floated between descriptive and interpretive phenomenological methods, never placing myself firmly on one side or the other. The data guided me on this decision. This is akin to the Utrecht school of phenomenology (Reiners, 2012), where descriptive and interpretive approaches are combined to both understand and describe an experience. Letting the data guide the research process was considered to be an acceptable or even preferred method for finding the essence of the study (Crabtree & Miller, 1999). In addition, many phenomenologists suggested that we should not become overly caught up in the specific schools of thought, especially early on the in the research process (Brown & Toadvine, 2003; Miller, Veletsianos, & Doering, 2008; Silverman, 2007). Qualitative research methods allow for flexibility (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 2007), and this is just one more reason why I prefer to work within such methods. Whenever a study is conducted on a small population within a unique environment, generalization is not usually an option (Merriam, 2009a). Keeping these limitations in mind, the study can still be of value to the field of IDT and perhaps to higher education in general.

Researcher Bias

Researchers bring varying levels of bias to whatever they may study (Merriam, 2009b). To combat my bias, I wrote memos and journaled to bracket out as much bias as possible (Ortlipp, 2008). My experience with bracketing suggests that one can never fully dispel one's bias, but that the bias can be brought to light. In my own experience with bringing my biases to light, I found that some of my ideas about what it meant to be a faculty member were wrong and others were fairly accurate. Some of my bias developed from working with higher education faculty on various technology projects and making assumptions about their experience. In addition, I developed some ideas about the participants based on works they had written, mentally placing them into categories that were sometimes wrong. Regardless of the kinds of bias I brought to the study, the most effective way to combat it was through member checking. Because all participants were rather thorough with their analysis of my writing, they were explicit in their feedback, especially when I incorrectly characterized or described their experience. For some participants, there were multiple iterations of member checking. Not only did this help with bias management, but it also improved the dissertation.

The Pilot Study

Conducting a small pilot study before beginning a qualitative study can help hone the researcher's focus (Janesick, 1994), so I first conducted a pilot study that examined how mobile technologies shaped faculty-student relationships. My interest in the topic started with the roll out of an iPad program for incoming freshmen where I worked. Similar programs were taking place at many other universities (Foote, 2012; Manuguerra & Petocz, 2011; PR Newswire, 2011). I worked closely with faculty on various technology-

related issues as a part of this project. As my relationships with faculty developed, I was fascinated with how these technologies affected, changed, and shaped relationships between faculty and student. My daily interactions with faculty revealed stories, insights, and observations about how their relationships with students were changing, and what this experience meant. It was never clear whether the changes in faculty-student relationships were good or bad – I only knew that the experience was changing.

Relationships between faculty and student have driven the learning process (Cotten & Wilson, 2006; Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, & Kearney, 1997; Zachary, 2000) and these faculty-student relationships have often been shaped by technology (Harper, Chen, & Yen, 2004). While the research in this area was already extensive (Cox, McIntosh, Terenzini, Reason, & Lutovsky Quaye, 2010; Hewitt & Forte, 2006; Steinkuehler & Williams, 2006), I wanted to look at how mobile technologies shaped relationships. I received IRB approval to conduct a series of interviews with faculty who were teaching freshmen classes with mobile technologies.

The following question guided the pilot study:

How have faculty experienced changes in their professional identity as a result of ubiquitous technologies?

In addition to the core-guiding question shown above, the following sub-questions were considered:

1. How do faculty construct their identity as professional teachers at the university in light of ubiquitous technologies?
2. How do faculty see their role as faculty in the university structure?

3. How do faculty experience the intersection of change, technology, and university culture in their profession?

Pilot study method. For the pilot study, I used semi-structured interviews to collect data, focusing on the following questions:

1. What has surprised you most about using this technology in your classroom?
2. How has using this technology changed the way you teach?
3. How has this technology changed your relationship with your students?
4. Do you see the technology as a bridge or a barrier between you and your students?
5. How has this technology changed the amount of time you spend preparing for class?
6. What would you do differently with the technology based on your experience so far?
7. What is your perception of student attitudes towards using the technology for this class?
8. How has this technology changed the way you assess the work of your students?
9. What are your biggest concerns regarding the use of technology in your class?
10. When other faculty members ask you about your opinion of using this technology, what kind of things do you tell them?

The interviews gave participants a chance to describe their experience and allowed me to practice many of the qualitative techniques I had studied. While my casual conversations with faculty came naturally, conducting a good interview proved difficult

(Kvale & Brinkmann, 2008). I interviewed 10 faculty members. Interviews lasted 20 – 50 minutes. The pilot study was very faculty-centric, meaning that views, opinions, insights, and experience data all came from the faculty perspective. While this limitation was a shortcoming, it allowed me to focus on the faculty experience. So many studies involving mobile technology are highly theoretical, with the researcher being far removed from the actual experience (Kukulska-Hulme & Traxler, 2005), but I was immersed in the environment on a day-to-day basis, and steeped in the data. This experience helped me empathize and relate to participants and enriched my study.

Though definitions of mobile technology abound (Christensen, Johnson, & Horn, 2008; Frohberg, Göth, & Schwabe, 2009; Weilenmann, 2001), for the purposes of the pilot study, I defined a mobile technology as any device that could be carried about and used without any external power for extended periods of time.

Pilot study results. It was through my pilot study that I found a way to my dissertation topic. In the pilot study, a theme I started calling 'out of balance' emerged. The experience seemed common among faculty who had been teaching for at least ten years. Faculty whose data fell into the 'out of balance' theme seemed to be struggling with a kind of crisis about their role as faculty: their identity as 'teacher' was changing into something new, and they were struggling to make sense of the experience.

One faculty member who taught up to five classes of freshmen per semester said,

> I used to be the teacher, but now they explain things to me. I've had to find a new way for myself, a new way of relating, and functioning, in the classroom. It hasn't been easy and I am still trying to make sense of it. But

> most of the time, I feel like I can't keep up, you know? Just when I start to get comfortable with one thing, like an iPad or whatever, you know, the new thing is, something else comes along. And I am nowhere near comfortable with the iPad yet. Let me just put that out there (laughing).

Another faculty member who was tenured and taught English composition said,

> There are moments when I feel like I am looking into the abyss. What do I do here? How do I make sense of this when I can't even understand it? All this technology, everywhere – but still, I want you to write something…this is how you do it – you write something and you hand it to me. I want them to be able to write – that is important to me and I want it to be important to them. This technology makes that hard. It makes it hard for me to teach. How do I compete with it?

Both of these segments where linked to the 'out of balance' theme. I saw these revelations as a glimpse into the disorienting changes that some faculty members face. Faculty members struggled with the instructional technologies used by their institution, and they also faced challenges with the technologies their students brought to class. These student-introduced technologies were at the invitations of the faculty members, and in many cases, faculty members did not prefer to have the technologies available. Instead, the technologies appeared as a *disruptive innovation*. A disruptive innovation is a 'game-changing' product, service, technology, or event that quickly and radically shifts power, structure, and systems (Christensen et al., 2008). In this case, it changed the nature of learning, teaching, and what it meant to be faculty. Though many people in their twenties are told that they will have multiple jobs and job identities over the course of their

working life, teachers over that age have been, at least historically, less likely to experience large changes in what it means to teach (J. H. Lawrence & Blackburn, 1985). Even the basic educational curriculum has been static as some schools offered no advanced technology courses to students (Zuga, 1997), or to faculty (Robertson, 2003). As paper-based textbooks disappear (Parker, Lenhart, Moore, & Pew Internet & American Life Project, 2011) and are replaced by digital books or web resources, even the usual physical objects upon which faculty once depended are quickly fading. Some faculty members even felt that they may eventually be replaced by these technologies (Paul, 2012).

Other faculty members thought that the technology worked as a tool for leveling the technological playground for students, eliminating the remnants of the digital divide (Dempsey, 2009). I uncovered a theme that I referred to as 'leveling' in quotations like this:

> I think that many of my students wouldn't have had access to anything – a laptop, certainly not an iPad, and now, by giving these to the students when they start, it makes it possible for everyone to have the same tools. This is important, here especially, because so many of these kids just don't, they don't have access to that.

Along the same lines, another faculty member noted that

> What this program does is makes it possible to establish a certain level of equality as far as what they have. Not many of our students can go out and get an iPad – they may have their phone – but that might be it. And it may not even be a smartphone. So, as a teacher you don't have to worry

about what the student has access to. I know you have an iPad because we gave you one and now I just have to make sure you know how to use it.

The pilot study revealed that the 'out of balance' and 'leveling' themes rarely occurred together. In other words, faculty who were coded as 'out of balance' rarely saw technology distribution as a way of giving students access to something they wouldn't normally have. The data suggested that some faculty members who are thrown out of balance may fail to recognize the beneficial aspects of technology.

Another reoccurring theme in the interviews was related to student video assignments. Comments centered on how the video assignments revealed much more about students than writing assignments revealed about them. Though faculty members did not always think of this additional student information as a positive development, I labeled the theme 'insight' – suggesting that, for better or worse, some technologies were giving faculty additional insight into the lives of their students. One faculty member said,

> Well, there's some uncomfortable situations. I mean, these videos, they are usually pretty good, but you see a lot. You see a lot of things that you don't necessarily want to see. Like, it makes me feel, I feel uncomfortable, like I'm some kind of voyeur.

From another faculty member:

> It's funny really because you see so much about your students that you wouldn't normally get from a paper they might write. The students are much more careful in a paper, but with video, they suddenly get to be themselves in a way that they don't think they can be when they write. So, that is good, but it's also, um, sometimes, it's awkward. They will

sometimes put things in the video that make me cringe. Things about their personal life, or things that they do. And I think, wow, you are putting yourself out there.

These themes painted a picture of the varied, complex experience of teaching in a technology-rich learning environment. There was a Janus-faced aspect (Arnold, 2003) to the phenomenological experience of using most technologies. In other words, there were pros and cons to this faculty experience. I was interested in how these technologies changed what it means to be a college faculty member. The stories, observations, and meaning-making from the faculty told me useful things about what it meant to teach and work in the academy, and revealed things I had overlooked.

Findings

The pilot study showed that technology was indeed shaping how faculty and students communicated and what it meant to teach. The main findings of the pilot study were:

1. Faculty felt that technology was changing their role too rapidly, and, as a result, they did not have a definitive professional identity. Many felt that they were more like administrators or facilitators than teachers.
2. Some participants believed that technology allowed the students to be more creative and expressive while other participants felt that it locked students into approaching the work from a tools-based perspective. All participants felt that the technology increased student excitement, but most were skeptical as to whether it improved learning outcomes. Some felt that providing technology helped to eliminate the digital divide.

3. Many of the participants struggled with how the insertion of technology changed their experience with students. Most participants experienced positive and negative experiences based on the technology integration. Follow-up with participants in the following year showed that half of the participants chose not to use the technology again.

Results of this study, along with a careful review of the literature as it relates to phenomenology, technology, and the lifeworlds of university faculty were used to support the purpose and design for this dissertation. In other words, based on findings in the pilot study mentioned here, and supported by the review of the literature in Chapter 2, the purpose of my study is to better understand the lived experience of tenured university faculty, particularly how they negotiated experiences related to the combined influences of technology, tenure, and teaching. While some have suggested that university faculty do not have the necessary skills to transition to this emerging technological era (McKee & Tew, 2013); this study did not attempt to make judgments about whether or not college faculty were prepared to shift their approach to teaching, nor whether such a shift was even necessary. Instead, my primary research questions were:

1. How did a group of tenured faculty negotiate which technologies entered their work and home life?
2. How did factors inside and outside of the university shape this experience?

Chapter Two

Review of the Liteature

This chapter begins with a discussion of phenomenological inquiry as it relates to this study. It continues by highlighting phenomenology in the field of Instructional Design and Technology and other studies that have investigated the faculty experience with regards to technology and university culture, and it ends with a restatement of purpose and guiding questions for this dissertation.

Phenomenological Inquiry: A Theoretical Frame

Phenomenology has a fascinating history filled with insight, disagreements, and sub-branches (Spiegelberg, 1981). I used both descriptive and interpretive phenomenological approaches, following the models, recommendations, and advice of Max Van Manen. Because phenomenology is steeped in philosophical ideas, I believed the theoretical and philosophical should not be separated (Crotty, 1998). Instead, I attempted to illustrate phenomenology in a way that allowed the complexity and beauty of it to step forward. I have come to see phenomenology as a blending and blurring of science and art (Eisner, 2004). It is a qualitative methodology that can enrich our understanding of what it means to be human, what it means to relate to our world, and what it means to experience our existence.

Husserl is considered the father of phenomenology (Dreyfus & Wrathall, 2009). Husserl was interested in human experience, and especially the essence of human experience (Husserl, 2001). He wanted to shut out the assumed perspective that we bring to an experience and bring a fresh perspective to the experience instead (Natanson, 1974). Husserl wanted to do away with the ‘taken for granted’ and return to ‘the things

themselves' (Husserl, 1970). Husserl was concerned that most people were going through their lives without carefully examining their experience (Husserl, 2012). When researchers take a fresh look or bring a fresh perspective to the examination and description of an experience, they are practicing phenomenology. Husserl held that when a researcher thoughtfully reflected on the experience of something, he/she was acting as a phenomenologist. Husserl believed that when we researchers bring our attention to the ways in which things appear or are experienced, we are not only deeply considering this experience, but also the philosophical meaning behind it (Macann, 1993). Husserl (1983) developed the concept of bracketing. Bracketing is a way of separating an experience into different pieces or components. Husserl started in mathematics and so his approach brings a somewhat scientific way of breaking things into pieces for closer examination (Natanson, 1974). Interestingly, Husserl believed that the hard sciences were somewhat faulty because they did not consider the larger world of experience, particularly human experience (Husserl, 1983). Some have described Husserl's approach as transcendental in nature (Zahavi, 2003), which I interpreted to mean that he was especially drawn to studying consciousness. I also supported the premise that consciousness plays an important part in any qualitative research practice, and saw it as especially critical in phenomenology, regardless of the specific methodological and philosophical approach with which one is aligned. While other phenomenologists criticized the notion of consciousness and avoided the word altogether (Heidegger, 2008), the concept of consciousness has a useful place in my study. Without consciousness, one merely moves gracelessly through the motions of research (Polkinghorne, 1989).

In addition to the concept of bracketing, Husserl developed his own terminology to explain his concept of phenomenology. Many of these words and concepts formed the basis for all the phenomenologists that came after Husserl, including those who sharply disagreed with him. These words are also concisely defined in the *Terms and Definitions* section of this document.

The 'lifeworld' is the space in which a phenomenon is examined, specifically how it is experienced by the thing being studied. Husserl used the term in two ways (Husserl, 2012). First, the lifeworld consists of the everyday beliefs and attitudes of those the researcher is studying. Second, the lifeworld may be constructed by the culture and environment through which one enters the world – those pre-constructed unquestioned items that we take for granted. In my study, I considered the lifeworld of the university professor, first having to understand how professors experienced their lives, specifically their identity or role as a university professor. This directly related to my inquiry about the faculty experience with ubiquitous technology: What do they take for granted about their existence in the space of the university? How might the culturally relevant environment of this particular university shape faculty belief structure, identity, and experience? Do faculty even consider the university structure a significant part of their lifeworld or is this a concept that I take for granted and need to bracket out?

'Intentionality' suggests that when we are practicing consciousness, we are being conscious about something. Intentionality means we bring a certain degree of intent to our consciousness, and that this intent shapes what we perceive, what we do, and how we do it. Some suggested that the introduction of these new words by Husserl prevent us from reifying certain concepts in phenomenology, particularly intentionality (Large,

2008). As opposed to intentionality, 'noesis' and 'noema' are much-debated concepts within Husserl's vocabulary. Noesis is the intention, and noema is the object onto which the intention is placed. The noetic gives the intention meaning. The noema is the receiver of this intention. While many philosophers disagreed on the exact meaning of these two terms, I did not get bogged down in the various interpretations of Husserl's vocabulary. Instead, I deployed these words when they seemed useful in the analysis of the faculty experience. I considered faculty descriptions of intended technology use as noesis, while the object of their intention represented noema. It is important to note that the two terms cannot be separated, as they are completely dependent on each other.

The final term I want to introduce is not necessarily attributed to Husserl, but is strongly associated with his work. Intersubjectivity is the "shared knowledge that exists between two persons regarding one another's conscious mental states" (Denzin, 2007, p. 20). This was an important concept for my study, as I examined the shared experience in the life of faculty. Intersubjectivity is constructed and maintained (even if only temporarily) through a series of shared emotional experiences (Denzin, 2007a). I consciously used Denzin's slightly updated explanation of intersubjectivity. My ability to connect with faculty on a deep emotional level added richness to my study, and much of my connection with faculty could be called intersubjectivity. I hoped that a sincere empathy, or intersubjectivity, guided my work.

Heidegger was a student of Husserl, and while his foundation in phenomenology started with Husserl, he made a clear break with his mentor by focusing more on the interpretative aspect of phenomenology. Heidegger was credited with moving phenomenology towards a more hermeneutic and existential approach (Inwood, 2002).

In what is perhaps his most cited work, *Being and Time* (2010), Heidegger introduced the word *Dasein* which means 'there-being'. Heidegger was interested in the nature of existence, and particularly how our lives, relationships, and the world around us shape our very being (Harman, 2007). He stressed that we have only a limited amount of time 'to be' in the world and that death is something that we all face alone, ending our time 'to be.' Heidegger felt that we could not exist without relatedness to the world. It was temporary, ever changing, and dependent upon the physical space in which we resided. Heidegger was interested in the nature of being and existence and rejected the idea that we could reach Husserl's ideal of a presupposition-less philosophy. Heidegger also put a much greater emphasis on the linguistic notion of being than his mentor did. In other words, Heidegger felt that our language was an essential part of our being, and could not be separated from our examination and analysis in phenomenology.

From Germany we move on to France, where phenomenology was developed even further. Merleau-Ponty is credited with moving the field towards an even more situated, or embodied, worldly perspective. He believed that we see ourselves as unique entities, different from everything and everyone else in the world (Merleau-Ponty, 2002). Merleau-Ponty was even more skeptical of traditional science because he felt it failed to adequately consider the perceptive nature of our individual experience with the world (Romdenh-Romluc, 2010). Though the work was unfinished when he died, *The Prose of the World* (1973) showed that Merleau-Ponty was similar to Heidegger in suggesting that language and meaning were inseparable in human meaning-making. Merleau-Ponty believed that our embodied experience emerges from a place of difference (Merleau-Ponty, 1969). As a result, we can only hope for a kind of emphatic understanding of

another's experience. We cannot fully understand the experience of another person because that experience is unique to the individual. Likewise, that person cannot fully understand our experience. Merleau-Ponty would say that two people teaching the same college course would have very unique experiences with the course, and neither could ever fully understand the experience of the other. Luckily, while Merleau-Ponty believed we cannot fully understand or represent the being of another person, he also believed that the being of another person cannot be put aside and the pursuit of understanding others is a worthwhile goal – even if it remains an unachievable one. He wanted us to understand a way of being that we might forget or lose touch with given our natural attitude, which sounds rather similar to Husserl.

Sartre took the existential theory of phenomenology even further by suggesting that our experiences are repeatedly remaking us. Sartre said we are never complete but are always becoming, our essence always being redefined by what is there, as well as what is not there (Sartre, 1981). His book *Being and Nothingness* (1993) looked at how the absence of something (a person, a thing) can have as much influence as something that is present. Such an approach to phenomenology might at first seem absurd, but such an outlook has something to offer – even in this study. For example, a professor who continues to teach without the use of any technology is impacted by its absence, even if she/he does not recognize it. Sartre was fascinated by the ongoing projects of a person's life and the meaning these projects gave the individual. Sartre suggested that an individual consciousness cannot be pinned down because it is always shifting and changing, just as the researcher is also changing. I related to this idea, and would argue

that my study is steeped in this belief. Faculty members are constantly changing, and part of what changes them is technology.

In this study, I aligned myself with the strand of phenomenology that is most similar to social constructivism (Gergen, 2001). My stance was closely aligned with Merleau-Ponty and Sartre, but also borrowed heavily from Husserl and Heidegger. I suggested that the phenomenon of faculty experience was socially constructed by the individual faculty member, along with his or her peers, administrators, students, and a potential host of other entities such as technologies. This construction happened consciously and unconsciously, by considering what was there as well as what was not there. Bourdieu (1987) suggested that the presentation of a person's life history is a way of trying to make sense of one's individual experience and a phenomenological approach brought some light to these visible and hidden spaces. The narratives I collected from the faculty offered a constructivist view of their experience. After all, we have no better way to relate our life experience than through narrative (Maynes, Pierce, & Laslett, 2008). Sartre (1981) believed that people could only relate to each other through stories, and it is stories that I collected from the faculty. Bruner (1959) suggested that the stories and myths we tell help us make sense of our lives. Social constructivism suggests that we are shaped by all the people we have known, the experiences we have collected, and the life events yet to come (Owen, 1995). The faculty members I interviewed gave me their socially constructed stories, little carvings of their life experience.

Van Manen (1990) noted that when we do phenomenological research, we question how we experience the world as human beings. We question the secrets of the world in hopes of revealing insights, shattering illusions, and shining a light onto the mystery of

being. I was moved by Van Manen's (1990) discussion of phenomenological research as an act of caring. He cited the Austrian psychologist Ludwig Binswanger (1975) who suggested that we can only understand someone if we truly care about them. I strongly identified with this ideology and felt that such a sentiment was essential in my work. Phenomenology asks the researcher to develop a deep, rich understanding of the internal, personal experiences of the other. By caring about our subjects, a deeper connection is established, and we are likely to work harder to understand their experience.

Van Manen (2006) believed that the practice of phenomenology was inseparable from the writing itself. Citing Heidegger, Van Manen asserted that good phenomenological writing takes place when we do not attempt to follow a prescriptive method, but instead forge a path that is uniquely our own. Thus, good phenomenological work reveals that the researcher is comfortable with venturing into unknown territory in an effort to get at something's essence.

When Amedeo Giorgi started his academic career at Duquesne University, he was asked to develop a research method based on phenomenology (Giorgi, 2009). Feeling as though his understanding of phenomenology was limited, he spent six years studying the philosophical traditions of phenomenology, working very closely with the philosophy department, often taking their classes to gain a better understanding. Giorgi articulated that when we study experience, the experience of the subject can be full of illusions and misconceptions, but that we are not required to (nor should we) make attempts to correct or change our descriptions of such experience. Giorgi also encouraged use of the imagination when attempting to understand a phenomenon. When he spoke of the descriptive method, and the role of imagination in writing up the phenomenological

description, he made a strong case for legitimacy while explaining the difference between description and interpretation (Giorgi, 1992). Giorgi made a special effort to establish this descriptive approach in fields outside of psychology, and also made use of suspended judgment in order to get to a deeper level of understanding, suggesting that no part of the phenomenological process is arbitrary (1989, 2005).

My substantive theory combined social constructivism (Burr, 2003; Gergen, 2001) with a phenomenology of existentialism (Wartenberg, 2008). At first glance, such a combination might seem impractical, but given the enigmatic nature of identity and experience, these two theories complement each other (Klugman, 1997). Social constructivism suggests that people are guided, shaped, and influenced in a multitude of ways by the social structures and people around them (Burr, 2003). Existentialism suggests that people are given tremendous freedom to make choices about their actions, and that we are ultimately individually responsible for our choices (Wartenberg, 2008). I worked in a way that allowed me to consider the faculty experience through the lens of both these theories. For example, I looked at whether the faculty experience was shaped by the forces described in social constructivism -- such as pressure to use technology in order to adhere to an administrative mandate or to relate to students -- or whether faculty made choices based on their own accord, ignoring or simply not considering the surrounding social structure. I could not work in a context that completely separates those I study from the environment in which they are studied (Laing, 1991); thus, I tended to examine experiences as being shaped by a social constructivist or an existentialist view. Some faculty put forth experiences that inhabited both of these views. Consider the dichotomy of social constructivism and existentialism as another rendering of the 'Janus-

faced' experience of mobile technology (Arnold, 2003). Having two frameworks that questioned each other seemed to enrich the study.

The practice of phenomenology was popular at the time of my study, and some have suggested that it is increasing in popularity (Friberg, Claesson, Berndtsson, & Öhlén, 2007). Rather than dive deeper into the debate of what constitutes a phenomenological study (Parry, 2011), I have highlighted some important phenomenological studies from the past ten years to illustrate the effective and versatile aspects of phenomenology.

Phenomenology has been used extensively in the field of communication's cultural studies programs to uncover, for example, the ways audiences make sense of a text (Barker, 2011), or how computer games shape our being (Crick, 2010). Popular culture studies have also embraced phenomenology to dismantle a variety of pop texts. See Carroll and Tafoya (2000) for an entire book of phenomenological pop culture studies. Another example is how Bruder and Ucok (2000) used symbolic interaction and phenomenology to better understand how patrons experience art in a museum. Their findings suggested that viewers of art shaped their identity in relation to the art they viewed. These studies from the field of communication hinted at what I might consider in my own study.

Phenomenology in the Field of Instructional Design and Technology

Cilesiz (2011) suggested that there are three main areas of phenomenological study in the field of IDT:

1. student experience with online education
2. teacher experience with technology integration
3. the psychological experience of end-users with various technologies

In this study, both the overall faculty experience with technology and the faculty members' psychological experience with various applications and interfaces fall into the second and third categories. I collected information about how faculty have or have not integrated technology, and also focused on the faculty members' understanding of identity as an entry-point to their individual psychological experiences. Perhaps my biggest critique of Cilesiz's work (and the work of many other IDT researchers) is that we sometimes fail to examine the naturally-occurring phenomenon of existing technologies used every day in and out of the classroom -- in other words, those technologies that are used to do 'taken-for-granted' tasks such as grading, writing, or communicating, and the meaning made of those technologies. Such technologies are not merely tools used for our jobs, but they are a larger and ever-growing part of our lives (McCarthy & Wright, 2007). Cilesiz (2009, 2011) made a compelling argument for the use of phenomenology in the field of IDT, suggesting that our field needs to understand how individuals experience technology, particularly with regards to the experience of technology in teaching and learning . She believes that understanding this experience is essential to improving the quality of what we do in IDT, and I tend to agree with her. It appears as though few people in our field have responded to Cilesiz' call, so this paper seeks to heed her call and fill this gap in the literature. The AECT handbook (Spector, 2008) hardly mentioned phenomenology at all, and most qualitative methods textbooks are careful not to delve too deeply into the complicated philosophical territory of phenomenology. Cilesiz (2009) looked at how young people experienced learning technologies in informal spaces, specifically Internet cafes in Turkey. She focused phenomenologically on the experience of adolescent learners in such spaces.

Howard (1994) explored how adults experienced their first time using a computer; these adults, however, were not faculty. Howard found that new computer users seemed to pass through various phases in their experience, including excitement, anticipation, frustration, and disillusionment. Howard also described this experience with the computer as an encounter with the "other." While the participants in my study are not first time users of computers, their cycles of experience with technology share some similarities with Howard's participants.

Closer to my own study was Miller, Veletsianos and Doering's (2008), which focused on the experience of distance education instructors in anchor-based learning environments. Though this study was very course-specific, and the environment was unique, it showed me that phenomenological methods were appropriate for my study. They collected data through intensive interviews, giving participants space to tell their compelling stories of teaching in this adventuresome setting. Because they were studying teachers and the experience of teaching, the article expanded my ideas on how to approach the faculty in my own study.

Phenomenological studies have had a small but important space in the history of IDT research and a slightly larger space in the overall body of educational research. Though technology mediates experience on a number of levels (Jonassen, 1984), and though education is made up of experiences (Dewey, 2005), the mediated technological experience of education and professional educators is still an understudied phenomenon. Phenomenology is a path towards the 'thick description' that so many qualitative researchers seek (Doyle & Silverman, 2001). Because phenomenology relies so heavily on the experience of the participants, it is a naturally fertile garden for exploration.

Van Manen and Adams (2009) used phenomenological analysis to examine the experience of writing online, looking specifically at what it meant to use a virtual space to construct prose. The piece was highly theoretical and offered no practical advice for those writing in virtual spaces. Phenomenologically speaking, it analyzed the experience of writing online, using an interdisciplinary approach to describe, highlight, and expound on the experience. In a similar vein, van Manen (2010) used a phenomenological approach to look at whether the meaning of privacy had changed in light of digital social media. He suggested that secrecy must be restored to society so that children can have a proper childhood. He went so far as to say that relationships cannot have meaning without some degree of secrecy. His analysis focused on interpreting online conversations as texts, while he tried to make sense of the experience of others in a digital space. The piece was especially meaningful to my study because of his deep questioning of our taken-for-granted notions of meaning, privacy, and relationships. These same themes emerged in my own study.

Velestianos and Miller (2008) used phenomenology to examine the experience of student interactions with pedagogical agents (avatars) in online learning environments. By using phenomenology in their study, they found that many similarities exist between pedagogical agents that are virtual and more traditional pedagogical agents. Velestianos and Kimmons (2013) examined how university faculty experience online social networks. They found that social networks present another space in which faculty must maintain their personal and professional identity; they also represent spaces that rob faculty of time – time that might be better spent on other activities. Continuing to use phenomenology, the same researchers found that some faculty find social networks to be

rather frustrating as a learning platform (Veletsianos, Kimmons, & French, 2013). These studies had results that were very similar to my study, suggesting that the ways in which faculty embrace or reject various technologies tends to be a highly personal process, driven by the individual's beliefs and perceptions of technology.

In summary, the field of IDT is just beginning to embrace phenomenology. While the call was issued to conduct more phenomenological studies (Cilesiz, 2011), little movement has been made recently with the exception of Veletsianos' work. In addition, some phenomenological studies have looked at the teaching and learning experience of technology, but most of these studies were focused on the experience of a particular kind of technology, and many of these works have been highly theoretical. In other words, the studies were techno-centric and put forth theories that may or may not be supported by actual data. For example, Kozel's study (2008) looked at the artistic experience of technology in various lifeworld perspectives, and while it gives researchers much to think about in how to approach a techno-centric phenomenological study, it is highly theoretical. In a similar vein, Fallman (2003) does a theoretical study of mobile interactions, focusing on the human-computer interactions component and how the technology mediates experience. Another example is Hultgren's (1995) phenomenological study of teaching and learning that looks at the experience of teaching, but not at how technology shapes the experience. My study fills a gap in the literature by looking more broadly at the faculty experience with a range of technologies.

University Culture

My study attempted to parse the 'conflicting psychological identities' (Josselson & Harway, 2012) that my participants faced. Notions of what it meant to teach and whether

participants considered teaching an important part of their job at the university were revealed in conversations about their experience. Societal forces from outside the academic environment also played a role in their experience.

Existing literature that has focused on the university has often offered a kind of social constructivist approach (Lawler, 2008) to faculty experience. Such an approach aligned well with my own social constructivist framework. Similar to Gergen (2001), I saw epistemological claims as being based in a communal structure -- in this case, the structure of the academy. Indeed, academic structure and the culture of the academy were omnipresent in my study, and they appeared throughout my analysis of the data.

Winter (2009) for example, offered useful insight into how corporate business values had infiltrated the university, and how this caused deep anxiety amongst faculty. One shortcoming of his article, however is that he never mentioned technology. Though his observations were astute, particularly as they applied to the disconnect between values and identities in many universities, I thought his study could have been strengthened by looking at how technologies helped bring about this problem, and whether or not technologies could be used to solve them.

Whitchurch (2010) made similar observations about the intersection of public and private university research space, furthering the idea that faculty professional identity was hard to grasp and understand. There was no mention of technology in this paper, as it focused on the often nebulous but essential institutional roles that some must play in order to keep institutions moving forward. Billot (2010) also addressed the tension of academic identity, but with no mention of the role of technology. Instead Billot looked at the many conflicts that arise from the competing demands on academics, and the forces

that drive these demands from within the academy. The study paints a picture of a high pressure environment often driven by stress and conflict, and some of the participants in my study have provided a similar outlook with their data.

A large portion of almost any university budget is applied towards various kinds of technology. This intersection of technology and finance has had a complex -- and often unpleasant effect -- on some institutions and professions. For example, Jason Lanier (2010) suggested that all kinds of institutions (including higher education) were being eviscerated and reshaped by technology, reminding his readers that institutions were still dependent on human use of technology. He was critical of how a techno centric focus ignored the professional and personal lives of people. In many ways, he lamented the loss of the human in our work and lifeworld. My study focused on the oft-missing human aspect of the faculty experience as it related to and was shaped by technology. Some of my participants would relate to Lanier's concerns, while others might have suggested that his view was too pessimistic. There was some consensus amongst my participants on the damaging loss of face-to-face human interaction if educational interactions turned into only online experiences. Interestingly, my participants did not teach online classes -- in fact, most resisted it.

University Faculty and Technology

Faculty experience with technology is complex. While many studies have looked at how faculty have or have not integrated technology into their teaching (e.g., Adams, 2002; Baldwin, 1998; Bullock & Ory, 2000; Butler & Sellbom, 2002; Groves & Zemel, 2000; Hargreaves, 1994; Harper et al., 2004; Jackowski & Akroyd, 2010; Jacobsen, 1998; Keengwe, Kidd, & Kyei-Blankson, 2009; Surry & Land, 2000; Tabata & Johnsrud,

2008; Unwin, 1969), it is rare to find studies that carefully examine the overall faculty experience *with* technology.

Another shortcoming in more recent educational studies is that frequently the experience, impact, and meaning of technology in educational settings is too often completely absent from the study. For example, when researchers considered what might shape faculty-student interactions outside the university classroom, Cox, McIntosh, Terenzini, Reason, and Lutovsky (2010) did not consider how technology may have shaped the quality, quantity, and meaning of such interactions. While it is true that these researchers may not have been looking at their study through the lens of an IDT researcher, it is hard to imagine that a study on this topic occurring just a few years ago did not consider the role of technology in such interactions.

Though it is a much less robust study, Roblyer, McDaniel, Webb, Herman, and Witty (2010) suggested that faculty were much less likely to use social media sites to communicate with students and preferred to communicate with students via e-mail. While students were more comfortable with social media communication platforms, faculty found them to be problematic, confusing, and too public. Despite efforts to get faculty to use social media platforms (Joosten, 2012), considerable resistance remains. The participants in my study displayed a mix of resistance and acceptance of these platforms, but it would be a stretch to say that any of my participants were enthusiastic about social media. These digitally mediated communications are a significant portion of faculty-student interactions, but studies that consider the meaning that faculty make of these interactions are all too rare. Some studies have looked at the general social media landscape (*Electronic elsewheres*, 2010) as a space between worlds, and this is somewhat

reflective of the experience of my participants. New studies on social media are emerging quickly (*Social media in higher education*, 2013), but Velestianos is one of the few people in our field doing this kind of work. Social media is not the focus of my study, but it does make an appearance in the lives of each of my participants.

While IDT researchers are only beginning to consider the phenomenological faculty experience with technology, there are some existing qualitative and quantitative studies that address the broader faculty experience with technology. In a study on faculty who were just beginning to teach hybrid or fully online classes (Hixon, Buckenmeyer, Barczyk, Feldman, & Zamojski, 2012), researchers found that online mentoring for faculty who were new to online teaching was generally well received. These researchers used a survey instrument to determine how the faculty experienced a unique preparation program for new online teachers. The most important finding in this study as it relates to my own study is that the less confidence faculty have in their technical abilities, the less likely they will be to embrace and use technology in their teaching. This study illustrates the complex picture of what it might mean for faculty to embrace a technological innovation such as online teaching. The faculty experience in my study involved a complicated mix of motivation and caution, just as the findings in this study suggested.

Wright (2013) interviewed faculty and staff at a technical university about their experience with innovation, research, and technology, and how these things were accepted or rejected within their institution. The researcher never said precisely what methodology he was using to conduct this study, but his primary data collection method was via interviews. While this study was primarily interested in examining how faculty-driven innovations may or may not become commercialized, his study revealed that

faculty at different institutions share many of the same overall challenges and experiences; however, these challenges and experiences are frequently driven by the overall culture, policies, and attitude of the institution. The study also showed that departments tend to be cut out from each other with little interest in someone else's work and innovation until someone begins to make money from it.

Jones and Jones (2005) conducted a survey of college faculty to consider how the Internet was shaping their experience in the academy. While this study lacked the individual detail of my study, the findings offered a fairly accurate overview of the experience of my participants. For example, participants in their study suggested they felt increasing pressure from college administrators and students to use more technology. Overall, their participants felt that technology had increased their interactions with students (particularly via e-mail) and that the Internet had greatly increased the amount of research data that was available to faculty. Participants also noted the challenges that technology, and the Internet in particular, had brought, including but not limited to plagiarism, higher student expectations in response time, and easy access to inaccurate information.

Other studies have suggested that faculty are becoming more receptive to technology. For example, Allen, Seaman, and Babson (2012) found that many faculty are embracing many forms of digital scholarship for their students; however, the study also noted that faculty remain skeptical of publishing their own work in online journals that might be seen as less selective in their publishing standards. This study also pointed to a gap between the perception of university administrators and faculty regarding Learning Management System usage. It seems that administrators believe that LMS usage on their

campus is much higher that actual usage by faculty. The most interesting finding in this study as it relates to my own study was that female faculty reported feeling more stressed as a result of digital communication technologies than their male counterparts.

Lawrence and Lentle-Keenan (2013) used a case study methodology to look at what shaped and influenced faculty technology choices, finding four main factors:

1. Teaching beliefs, experience, and practice
2. Perception of technology
3. Technology as a teaching and learning tool
4. Institutional priorities and division of labor

While Lawrence and Keenan (2013) looked more specifically at how faculty went about building and teaching a particular course, their findings were largely reflective of my own findings. For example, they found that faculty tended to have opinions about technology and what it would mean to use technology based on their previous experience and perceptions. Those existing perceptions tended to drive their decisions and outlook, whether positive or negative. The institutional culture and the agenda of the institution were also important factors shaping the faculty experience.

In his essay about the colliding cultures of higher education and information technology, Ayars (2004) suggested that technologies have not fully delivered on their promise to higher education. He goes further to say that faculty and technology workers do not understand or appreciate each other and that this failure in understanding has held back technological progress (among other things) in higher education. In a sense, he seems to be suggesting that if we can better understand the faculty experience of technology, it might generate more understanding, collaboration, and even sympathy

between faculty and IT workers. Such a suggestion is one of the things that drove my study and relates to some recommendations I make towards the end of this dissertation.

Based on findings in the pilot study mentioned in Chapter 1, and supported by this review of the literature, the purpose of my study is to better understand the lived experience of tenured university faculty, particularly how they negotiated experiences related to the combined influences of technology, tenure, and teaching. While some have suggested that university faculty do not have the necessary skills to transition to this emerging technological era (McKee & Tew, 2013), this study did not attempt to make judgments about whether or not college faculty were prepared to shift their approach to teaching, nor whether such a shift was even necessary.

My primary research questions are:

1. How did a group of tenured faculty negotiate which technologies entered their work and home life?
2. How did factors inside and outside of the university shape this experience?

Chapter Three

Research Design and Methodology

Choosing the Methodology

Qualitative methods overlap and intersect (Merriam, 2009b), and, of them, phenomenological texts and methods are not for the faint of heart (Locke et al., 2007). Even experts in phenomenological philosophy acknowledged the difficult intellectual terrain of most phenomenological texts (Giorgi, 1997); however, phenomenology offered the most appropriate approach to this subject matter. Qualitative methods rely on thick description, triangulation, and member checking (Creswell & Miller, 2000) as well as good writing, but a phenomenological study is especially dependent on the researcher's ability to describe the lived experience through a good, compelling narrative (van Manen, 2006).

My dissertation was a phenomenological study because I wanted to understand the essence of the human experience for faculty, looking specifically at how technologies have changed and shaped their professional experience. I shaped my questions, data collection methods, and data analysis methods to get at that experience. I took a creative approach to the work (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). What I paid attention to in my daily life shaped my choice of what to study (Rubin & Rubin, 2004), creating a connection between my research and my lifeworld.

Context

The context and situatedness of a study is important. The phenomenological framework in which I worked encouraged me to consider the experience of others within the context of their lives, their workplaces, and their living spaces. This context was

embedded in the space where the study took place, as well as in the physical bodies of the participants. My study took place in a large urban university in the southeastern United States. This university was experiencing rapid change driven by technology, economics, and politics during the time of the study. The university raised tuition prices several times in the past ten years. Most university employees (including faculty) had not had a pay raise in more than five years. The university was also one of the most diverse higher educational institutions in the United States. Some of the faculty with whom I interacted at the university suggested that the institution was having an identity crisis as it attempted to switch from being a 'commuter school' to a more traditional university and research institution. The past ten years had seen a rapid expansion in the physical and virtual presence of the university as more and more students attended from around the world.

Participant Selection

No formula exists for finding the ideal number of participants for a phenomenological study (Smith et al., 2009). Phenomenology does not attempt to generalize findings, and data saturation is not possible, because every participant tends to have a unique phenomenological experience (Grbich, 2007). In fact, phenomenology itself does not have a meaning on which everyone agrees (Lyotard, 1991). Though no rule or formula exists for an appropriate number of participants for a phenomenological study, previous phenomenological studies suggested that as few as three participants are enough (Giorgi, 1997; Given, 2008; Moustakas, 1994); however, I chose five faculty participants for my study. The data I collected from these five participants provided enough data to develop several themes, but also kept me within a range of manageability. Looking at the phenomenological literature, I saw a wide range of participant group sizes.

Researchers studying wisdom in aging adults conducted a study using six participants (Montgomery, Barber, & McKee, 2002). To study the nature of empathy in nurses, nine participants were used (Baillie, 1996). When examining teacher beliefs about instructional choice, researchers interviewed thirty-six teachers (Flowerday & Schraw, 2000). Hoping to gain insight into how clinical teachers used problem-based learning techniques, researchers studied fourteen physicians during six group conversations (Dornan, Scherpbier, King, & Boshuizen, 2005). Englander (2012) suggested that we look for a good representation when we do a phenomenological study and suggested that we should not overly concern ourselves with sample size. Giorgi (2009) believed that we only need more than two participants to do a phenomenological study.

The five participants had to dedicate themselves to my study in that they had to spend several hours in interviews. Because of this requirement, there were challenges in finding faculty members willing to commit to the time needed for the study. To ensure that I had a wide pool of potential participants, I opened my study to faculty from two of the colleges at the university: the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education.

Both of these colleges had extensive web sites that listed faculty members and their titles. Most faculty members had a curriculum vitae available as part of their professional web profiles. The curricula vitae revealed how long they had been teaching at the university. I only considered faculty members who had spent at least the last ten consecutive years teaching at this university and were at the Associate Professor level or higher. The participants taught both undergraduates and graduates. Faculty members who had taken a sabbatical in the past ten years were excluded from the participant selection pool.

I listed two potential participants in a spreadsheet from each department in both colleges, assuming that department had two faculty members who met the criteria. While some departments had several faculty members who met the criteria, I stopped at two potential participants at this phase in the process. The selection process was alphabetical, meaning that if a faculty member met the criteria and appeared at the top of the list, he/she was added first. Whenever possible, I tried to pick one male and one female faculty member from each department, but sometimes a department had two of the same sex listed in the spreadsheet. For example, if the first name in the list was a male, I would skip other males until I came to a female in the list (assuming there was a female on the web site). I did not include or exclude participants based on ethnicity, nationality, or sexual orientation. While phenomenology calls for purposive sampling (Cashman & McCraw, 1993), my main purpose was to find faculty members who had been teaching for ten years.

To inquire whether a faculty member would like to participate, I contacted him/her individually via e-mail with the following:

> *Dear Faculty,*
>
> *My name is Joe Horne and I am a Ph.D student in the field of Instructional Technology. I am seeking five (5) Associate Professors who have taught at this university for at least ten (10) years to participate in a phenomenological study. My study will examine the lived experience of faculty identity and whether or not technology has shaped professional identity formation for faculty. There are three (3) components to this study:*

1. *Photography*
2. *Interviews*
3. *Syllabi*

For the photography, you will be asked to take a picture of something representing how you saw yourself as a teacher ten years ago, and then a second picture of how you see yourself as a teacher today. If you do not have a camera for doing this, I will provide a camera for you to do this. There will be three interviews over the course of 3 – 4 months. Interviews will last approximately 90 minutes and can take place at the time and location of your choice. All interviews will be audio recorded and transcribed. I will also ask for copies (electronic or paper) of syllabi from classes that you taught over the past ten (10) years. Your identity will be protected throughout the study and will not be revealed in publications, presentations, or other artifacts produced from the data I collect. I am unable to compensate you for your time in this study.

If you might be interested in participating in this study, please let me know via e-mail. I am happy to answer questions you may have about this study. If you agree to participate, I would like for you to take your two pictures and conduct your first interview in the next 30 days.

Sincerely,

Joe Horne

Once I had five dedicated participants, I stopped asking for volunteers. No participants were compensated for participating in this study; however, at the conclusion of the final

interview, I gave participants a gift bag of gourmet food items with an approximate retail value of $15. I decided to do this at the end of the study, and participants were not told they would receive a gift bag. No participants dropped out of the study.

Participant names were changed to protect their identity through this study. This table shows key attributes of the five participants:

Table 1. Participant Attributes

Participant	Bert	Patricia	Matt	Sandra	Charles
Gender	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Title	Full	Associate	Associate	Associate	Full
College	Arts and Sciences	Arts and Sciences	Arts and Sciences	Arts and Sciences	College of Education
Parent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Married	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Data Collection Procedures

There are many useful, thoughtful guidelines for collecting data for qualitative studies (Wolcott, 2008). I examined dozens of phenomenological studies to find a path that made sense. During this study, I collected three types of data (art data, interview data, and syllabi data), however, for the dissertation, I focused exclusively on data taken from the interviews.

Though my research question was narrow, I wanted to create an open space for my participants to talk about their experiences. Though I followed the traditional semi-structured interview format, my questions were open, and tapped into the unique narrative discourse and stories of the faculty. The first interview focused on the following questions:

1. When people ask you to describe what you do for a living, what kinds of things do you often say to them?
2. What is a typical day like in your professional life?
3. Tell me about the technology you use to do your job as a teacher.
4. Tell me about the technology you use to do your job as a researcher.
5. What were your expectations or ideals about being a professor?
6. What is the reality compared to that ideal?
7. How do you think technology has helped you professionally?
8. How do you think technology has harmed you professionally?
9. Has technology made you more or less productive?
10. How has technology changed the way you teach something?
11. How has technology changed the quality of your teaching?
12. How has technology changed the quality of your research?
13. How has technology changed your professional identity?

The first interview lasted between 65 minutes and 110 minutes.

During the second interview, I focused more directly on their lived experience. Interviews were structured around the following open questions but also included specific follow up questions that were unique to each participant:

1. Tell me about some of the moments in your teaching career when you started to notice how technology was altering your profession.
2. Compare how you teach a class today with how you taught a class ten years ago.
3. What does it mean to you to be a teacher today? How does it differ from when you entered the profession?

4. What surprises you most about teaching at this point in your career?
5. Do you think technology has strengthened or weakened your profession and why?
6. Tell me about a time when technology was useful to you as a professor.
7. Tell me about a time when technology failed to live up to your expectations as a professor.
8. Do you find teaching at the university to be as rewarding today as it was ten years ago? Why or why not?
9. How has technology changed the way you interact with your students?
10. How has your profession changed as a result of technology?

The second interview lasted between 60 and 80 minutes.

The third interview was more philosophical in nature and focused on the following questions often revolving around their identity:

1. Do you ever have any conflicts at work where you struggle with your identity as a 'teacher' (or professor) and your identity as something else?
2. What about the reverse, where you have a conflict at home that involves your identity as a teacher?
3. Do you feel a strong connection to your identity as a teacher?
4. How do you think your identity as a teacher has changed over the past ten years?
5. What if you won the lottery and you didn't need any money anymore, do you think you would continue to teach?
6. Do you ever feel like your work at the university pulls you away from things that you would rather do (family, other interests, etc.)?

7. Do you feel that technology has had any role in shaping your identity as a teacher?
8. Does technology ever present you with conflicts in your identity as a teacher and your identity as a father/mother, spouse/life partner, etc.?
9. Do you think that your life as a university professor is what you thought it would be?
10. Looking back over your career as a teacher, from where you are now, what are some of the things you are most proud of?
11. What are some of the things that you think you've had to let go of over the past ten years (as far as being a teacher)?
12. What are some things that you would like to let go of now, if you could?
13. How closely do you link your personal identity to your identity as a professor?
14. How personally satisfying do you find your job as a professor?
15. When you think of a group of professors, do you see yourself as a good fit for the group?
16. If you found out that the university was closing today (for whatever reason) what do you think you would do (for a job)?

The third and final interview lasted between 60 and 70 minutes. I concluded the final interview by giving the participants a chance to discuss whatever else they wanted to discuss regarding their profession and technology. I followed up with faculty not only for general member checking, but to also deepen my understanding of their experience. The member checking was done after the first and second interview and more

comprehensively after their personal chapters were written. Finally, two faculty gave some feedback on the final chapter.

I asked faculty to reflect on their professional practice (Schon, 1984) to better understand their experience as a professional teacher or faculty member. A good phenomenologist does not make assumptions about a personal experience (Douglas, 1976), but instead attempts to make sense of what is offered in the interview. The complex intersections of technology, teaching, and tenure emerged in these stories and enriched my work.

I developed these interview questions to gain insight into my original research questions. They were designed to provoke storytelling. I hoped to give the faculty space to describe their experience in a way that was comfortable and meaningful to them. The nature of phenomenological studies requires that the interviewer be flexible enough to follow the unestablished, unexpected, and undetermined paths through the lifeworld of the participant. In the case of my study, I acted as a prompter, not an interrogator. While I dug into the meaning of experience with my subjects, I did not guide them to specific destinations, but instead followed the lanterns that shined from within their being. By minimizing my assumptions, and bracketing my own experience and expectations, I created space for their insights.

Data Analysis Procedures

I used the software Dedoose as a qualitative analysis tool. Dedoose enabled me to textually code and analyze the data in a variety of ways, and also enabled me to be faster and more efficient (Bazeley, 2007; Denardo & D, n.d.; Johnston, 2006). While technology played an important role in keeping things organized, the most important

analytical procedure was simply reading, again and again, the interview transcripts. In addition, I frequently listened to the audio recordings of the interviews, gaining insights about the participants' experiences from the tonality of their voices, musicality of the conversation, and phrasing of the words. The interviews were professionally transcribed, and I printed hard copies of the interview transcripts to read on trains and planes, before turning in for the evening, and whenever an opportunity would arise. While reading the hard copies, I hand-coded the data, and made notes in the margins. I highlighted what would later become key phrases in this manuscript. I kept track of the codes in an Excel spreadsheet.

Giorgi (2009) offered a model for the application of the descriptive phenomenological method, suggesting that until the method was applied in practice, it could not be fully understood. I started with reading and re-reading the transcripts (data) until they became familiar. I thought of this process as a kind of internal saturation of meaning. I then broke the data into 'meaning units.' These meaning units were similar to nodes in data analysis software (Bazeley, 2007), or codes in multiple extant coding methods (Saldana, 2009). Once the meaning units were established, I re-read or re-considered the data. Anytime I experienced a shift in a participant's perception, a mark was made on the text. Then I wrote up the meaning behind these meaning units with respect to the phenomenon being studied. Language was a critical component. I created charts where the researcher's writing stood alongside the original data from the participant.

Coding the Data

When conducting a phenomenological study, Van Manen (1990) suggested there was no single approach to research design, nor was there a single path for conducting

analysis. Van Manen stated that each phenomenological study required an approach that responded to the unique requirements of the study, and that how one approached a phenomenological study must be carefully thought through, planned, and explained. Phenomenological studies tend to be rich with meaning for the both the participants and the researcher (van Manen, 1990), Thus, it was relatively easy to find examples of simultaneous coding in the phenomenological literature (Giorgi, 2009; Introna, 2011; Silverman, 2007), which I used to apply two or more separate codes to the same piece of data (Saldana, 2009). My data required simultaneous coding as it usually had multiple meanings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and because "social interaction does not occur in neat, isolated units" (Glesne, 2006, p. 150). Experience is too rich with meaning to limit to a single code.

Because I had multiple participants, I used attribute coding to categorize and sort the faculty based on several personal characteristics. Attribute coding is widely used in many qualitative methods for sorting, analyzing, and parsing data (Saldana, 2009). I used attribute coding to see how responses varied based on the professors' characteristics like gender and professional status (Associate or Full), and this type of coding contributed to my study by highlighting important differences based on these characteristics.

These charts show the major themes discussed in this study as well as the codes used when analyzing the data.

Table 2. Codes for Technology, Teaching, and Tenure

Theme: Technology	Theme: Teaching	Theme: Tenure
PowerPoint	Classroom	Stress
Blogs	Face-to-face	Time
E-mail	Online	Titles
Prezi	Socratic	Associate

iPad	Maieutic	Full
Smartphone	Learning	Priorities
LMS (D2L)	Good teaching	Pressure
Facebook	Bad teaching	Restrictive
YouTube	Connecting	All consuming
Twitter	Craft	Packet
MOOCs	Coach	Trapped
Online learning	Mentor	Complacency
Open Access		Melancholy
Internet		Prestige
Laptop		Focus
Upgrade		Fear
Seduction		Standards
Video games		Publish
Civility		Service
Flame		Teaching
Healthcare		

Table 3. Codes for Time, Environment, Roles, Economics, Publish, Service

Theme: Time	**Theme: Environment**	**Theme: Roles**	**Theme: Economics**	**Theme: Publish**	**Theme: Service**
Waste of time	Recycle	Gender	Cost	Journals	Excel
Loss of productivity	Reusable	Mother	Debt	Time restraints	Reports
Library	Longevity	Wife	Capital allocation	Pressure	Feedback
Access	Consumerism	Husband	Pay	Feedback	Director of Graduate Studies
Family	Consumption	Father	Raises	Recognition	Waste of time
Weekends	Competition for resources		Loss of income	Online journals	Meetings
Work hours	Usefulness			Prestige	Committee
Evaporation	Energy use			Turn around time	Important
Stealing				Slow	Unimportant

Protection of Human Subjects

Phenomenological studies are most often based on the collection of data through intensely personal interviews, and my study followed this practice. The faculty stories belonged to the unique experience of the participants and offered a window of insight into their lifeworld (Becker, 1992). I tried to avoid the pitfalls of pretending that I was the participants' friend just to get the data (Duncombe & Jessop, 2002). The boundary between friend and colleague was hard to manage (Mitchell, 2008), but it also made the research richer, more colorful, and more impactful (Knowles, 2006). Though neither my safety nor the safety of my participants was at risk in this study (Kenyon & Hawker, 1999), there was always the lingering fear associated with job security.

Data is never truly secure. While I made every effort to protect my data with passwords, encryption and other tools, technologies and the people who made these technologies run into myriad security issues. This includes systems made by security experts. Nothing is ever completely safe when it comes to research (Wolcott, 2002). Technology has a way of complicating privacy in ways that we are only now beginning to understand (Tavani, 2010).

Role of the Researcher

Navigating the ethical terrain of qualitative research was sometimes like crossing a treacherous minefield with an outdated map. I come to this study from the wrong side of the tracks (Samarco & Muzzatti, 2005), but was fortunate to find other travelers who were familiar with my terrain. Like Polkinghorne (1988) suggested, I tried to help the reader better understand a particular experience. I rejected the traditional voice of the academy for a more personal tone (Richardson, 1997), and this plain writing helped the

meaning come through (Toor, 2012). As Bolton (1987) suggested, phenomenology is a way of approaching one's own consciousness.

My role in the research was complicated by many factors. First, during my doctoral studies, I was a student of three of the five participants in this study. I was not a student of any participants while the research was conducted. Second, during the course of the research, I sometimes felt that the participants were my friends, and on one occasion with one participant, I had an informal lunch. Though we did not discuss my research over lunch, we did discuss some of the same things we discussed in formal interviews. Finally, I should add that while this might trouble the reader about the quality of my research, I would argue that these deeper, more honest relationships strengthened my research. These more meaningful connections allowed me to talk about things with participants in a way that might not have happened with an outsider.

Rigor in Qualitative Research

All qualitative researchers depend on a firm grounding in rigor and trustworthiness. Denzin and Lincoln (2007) suggested that there are four potential factors to establish a high level of trustworthiness in qualitative studies: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. These factors were important in this study:

1. Credibility. For my study, I used extensive member checking with the individual faculty members to ensure I gave a fair representation of their experience. I also practiced negative case analysis (Padgett, 2003), where I reexamined each piece of data after the initial analysis was done to find contradictions and overlap in experience. Negative case analysis enhanced the rigor of my study (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) by getting me to deeply question seemingly conflicting themes.

When conflicts appeared, I reanalyzed the data to ensure that I had not misunderstood a participant's experience.

2. Transferability. It is tricky to think of transferability with regards to phenomenological research. In the case of my study, I thought of transferability not as a way for someone to duplicate my results, but to instead apply the results of my study to their own work. Thick description came into play. The better I described the nature of my study, the more applicable the study was to others. In addition, I used transferability to offer some guidelines to IDT workers who work with tenured faculty, transferring my understanding of the experience of participants into useful questions to consider when working with faculty on using technology.
3. Dependability. Dependability was a way of considering the stability of the findings over time and whether or not the data I collected properly related to my findings (and my interpretation). As I pointed out earlier, the experience of faculty is always evolving and shifting. The results were dependable at the time the study was conducted, but the reader should not assume that the participants would describe their experience in the same way today. Phenomenological experience does not work that way, but instead recognizes the ever-changing nature of our human experience and how meaning is constructed from it.
4. Confirmability. Confirmability was addressed by ensuring the researcher clearly explained how the data was analyzed step by step. Detailed information was offered on how participants were selected, how interviews were conducted and how the data was analyzed. Reflective journaling and memos were part of the

triangulation of the study. Member checking capped off the confirmability of my study, giving participants multiple opportunities to correct, expand, expound, and reimagine their experience. All participants provided feedback in conversation, through e-mail, and through a critique of my analysis and the write-up of the final results.

The next five chapters are focused on the individual participants in the study. Each chapter is an exclusive, in-depth examination of each participant. The following chapters are based on interview data and contain the following sections:

1. Introducing – This section is an overview of faculty members' experience, with a focus on tenure and how they see themselves.
2. Technology and Teaching Experience – This section examines the lived experience of the individual with technology and teaching, as well as other significant experiences within the academy.
3. Summary – This section is a summary of the participant's experience.
4. Codes – This table shows the twelve (12) most common codes that appeared in the data for this participant in this study.

Chapter Four

Bert

> I'm actually not particularly enchanted with the glitziness of technology. For me, technology is about functionality, so I am probably less seduced by it.
>
> Bert

> The satisfactions of manifesting oneself concretely in the world through manual competence have been known to make a man quiet and easy. They seem to relieve him of the felt need to offer chattering interpretations of himself to vindicate his worth. He can simply point: the building stands, the car now runs, the lights are on.
>
> (Crawford, 2010, p.15)

Introducing Bert

Bert was a tenured Full Professor in the College of Arts and Sciences. Though I did not ask anyone to give me his/her age, Bert told me he was 50 years old. Bert had an undergraduate degree in a technology field (though he did not teach in a technology-specific program). After finishing his undergraduate technology degree, he worked for a couple of years at a large technology consulting company. Then he worked for a few years in the Information Technology department at a large research university on the western coast of the United States. According to Bert, it was when he was working in this department (often interacting with students) that he realized he wanted to do something within academia. He started teaching as a GTA (Graduate Teaching Assistant) during his master's program at a large public university on the eastern coast of the United States,

and continued teaching in his PhD program at a large public research university in the Midwest. His first full-time teaching position was at a small private women's college in the Northeast, and then he relocated himself and his family to the southeast research university featured in this study. He has been there ever since.

Bert could have had a very successful and lucrative career in information technology; however, his intellectual curiosity and his enjoyment from working in an academic environment brought him to his current profession. In his own words:

> I was working with student organizations and student groups as a programmer analyst and so that was where I got bitten by the academic bug and said I want to teach. And then I thought about the many interests that I had had over the years, what do I want to teach in, and I decided it wasn't computer science. And so my interest – my professional interest in teaching kind of predates my interest professionally in the field. So I made that decision first.

Further dialogue revealed that something like an existential crisis caused Bert to consider this path. Like others, Bert came to teaching after trying another professional path (Palmer, 1999). Bert felt a calling, a sense of yearning to contribute to the growth and experience of others through teaching. Bert said that he was "bitten by the academic bug" and wanted something that would "feed his soul."

Bert grew up in the rural southeastern United States at a time when access to information was scarce (there was, for example, no Internet). Even things like cable television were not widely available, especially in rural parts of the United States. Bert described the limited television viewing options he had as a youngster. He had the

electric rotary system on his outdoor television antennae, which allowed him to get a modest variety of channels with unpredictable reception quality. This physicality as it relates to technology (the turning of an antenna, the turning of knobs on a television set, the rotary dial on a radio) was a part of his early experience.

Bert grew up in a working class family who valued hard work and dedication. In each interview, Bert referenced his father, a figure who had a lasting impact on the trajectory of Bert's life. The timbre of Bert's voice changed when he spoke about his Dad, moving from the sound of a well-rounded, matter-of-fact analysis, to the voice of someone who was in awe of this important life figure. It was a change from commentary to reverence. Bert picked up some scholarly traits from his father, who worked his manual labor job so that he could do what he loved: reading and studying the Bible. Bert's experience of his father's life and work arrangements was one factor that caused Bert to move forward with an academic career.

Bert was hired at the southeastern research university as an Assistant Professor. Three years before tenure (and the title of Associate Professor), Bert was named Director of Graduate Studies for his department. At the time, Bert felt he was unprepared for the responsibility of such a position; however, this role became an important part of his professional experience. During his time working as the Director of Graduate Studies, he was granted tenure. He continued to hold the position for three years after getting tenure, and then relinquished the position to a colleague. Several years later, Bert went up for and was granted the title of Full Professor, a position that he has held for several years. Bert believed that he would continue to be a professor for perhaps another 20 years before retiring, and he questioned how those twenty years should be spent.

Some people believe that teaching is an easy path, with long, uninterrupted vacations and short working hours. This view is often reinforced by the media ("The Least Stressful Jobs Of 2013," *Forbes*, 2013), but the participants in my study resolutely denied that academia was an easy path. Bert was especially resistant to such an idea, suggesting that the path to tenure was getting more and more difficult, and that he frequently pitied new assistant professors who were just starting out. Bert had stern warnings about how academia and the very life of an academic could easily become all consuming, a kind of treadmill from which one could not escape. He suggested that technology contributed to this academic treadmill by moving everything faster and faster.

Bert also saw himself and his fellow faculty as outsiders and even social misfits. Bert thought that being a social misfit was a requirement for being an academic. He pointed towards the typical academic as the kid who liked to be in school, tended to do well in school, and then ended up working within a school or school-like institution. Bert believed that this experience of 'social misfit' was a common thread among most academics and bound them socially. Bert likened his experience in academia to that of a family, suggesting that it was wonderful to work with people who supported his work, but that there were still times when an academic couldn't get along with or even understand his/her colleagues. Bert suggested that there was probably no such thing as a truly ideal work environment, but that the university was the closest thing to ideal that he had experienced.

When thinking back over the last ten years, Bert said he did not have any specific feelings about or associations with technology -- it was present, but not really something on his mind. Instead, he was very much focused on getting tenure in those years. While

he used technology to assemble his tenure package, to teach his classes, and to grade his papers, technology was not something about which he had strong memories. For Bert, that time was solely focused on successfully getting tenure.

Bert wanted to make sure that I understood that the process of getting tenure was stressful and that there was no way to be fully prepared for the experience. He spoke at length about the amount of scrutiny to which he was subjected during the tenure process. For Bert, the scrutiny seemed to matter much less post-tenure: in Bert's own words, "There's really nothing they can do to me now unless I fundamentally screw up somewhere." This belief brought some relief to Bert, offering a kind of freedom that might be unobtainable outside of the academy. Bert acknowledged this:

> I'm very aware of the enormous privilege that this university has provided me. I am in a faculty of bright people who are operating in different fields that enrich my own work and support me, and give a good amount of freedom. Yeah, as horrifyingly annoying as the whole place can be, yeah, when I come up with bits of my life I always put it in the context of that. I have it pretty good.

Bert was humble and sincere when he said this. He recognized that nothing was ever ideal, but that his current situation was perhaps as close as he would get to ideal. He seemed to wrestle with how to make the most of this privileged position.

Bert did not see technology as a significant factor in his teaching ten years ago, nor did he see technology as a significant factor in his life as a professor or academic now. He knew it was there, and accepted its power to shape what he did, but he felt it was within his control. He used the technology when appropriate and put it aside when it was

not. Bert believed that technology tended to reinforce other aspects of his life, but only when he allowed it to do so.

Bert felt he was reaching for a glass of water in the middle of a desert, trapped in sand up to his waist until he got tenure. When he gained tenure, life changed for the better. However, over time, both the meaning and Bert's attitude towards the gift of tenure evolved. In *Teaching to Transgress*, hooks (1994) noted that tenure made her feel trapped in her position at her institution. hooks' assertion reflects an underlying current of ambivalence that can develop over time for some tenured faculty members. As opposed to feeling ambivalent, Bert felt that tenure was a kind of bonus, an acknowledgment from his peers that he was doing good work. This was a serious and important part of what the university offered the professor, according to Bert, and the recognition via tenure came with far more positives than negatives.

Bert's Technology and Teaching Experience

Bert was not easily seduced by the marketing machines of technology companies, nor did he feel pressure from the administration of his department or the university in general to use or implement technology. Instead, he approached technology in a way that was pragmatic and simple. If a technology would improve something, he would use it. If a technology did not offer any real advantage over what he already used, he did not make a place for it. Bert partially attributed his approach to technology to his earlier schooling (undergraduate degree) in technology. He saw technology as a tool, nothing more. On the other hand, Bert was not afraid to use a new technology if it offered something that improved his teaching or research. As an example, Bert shared the story of how he was among the first professors in his department to use the Track Changes and Comments

features in Microsoft Word. He spoke enthusiastically about how this minor feature offered a huge improvement in how he liked to provide feedback to his students on their writing assignments. He also spoke about how this eliminated problems with students' being able to read his handwriting. To give another example of Bert's pragmatic approach to evaluating technology, he decided that computer tablets (iPads, for example) did not offer him anything that he couldn't already do with his laptop. He also suggested that typing on an iPad was not ideal for him, and he just couldn't see the point of getting one. When I asked him whether he felt that other faculty judged him for using an old laptop instead of a flashy iPad, his reply was, "Who cares?" Bert was at a stage in his life when he was not easily pressured about many things. Bert casually mentioned the "weak suggestions" to use technology from administration, but he did not see them as particularly meaningful.

Bert recognized the usefulness of the LMS system in place at his university and used it, particularly for graduate level classes; however, he was not interested or swayed by technologies that were merely new or cutting edge. He only used the pieces of the LMS that offered something to enhance or further his teaching style, and he seemed to think that the LMS discussion boards were especially useful for graduate students to share and critique each other's work. He was not only thoughtful about technology when it came to his teaching and research, but also for his personal use.

Bert recalled a time when he was giving a presentation to several people at an exclusive research university in the northeast in the early 2000s. He used PowerPoint for the presentation. The attendees from the exclusive school were much more fascinated by his PowerPoint presentation than its actual content. In other words, they were seduced by

the technology and completely missed Bert's message. Bert was annoyed by this and suggested that the experience changed his entire view of this exclusive institution. In addition, the experience made him more selective about using PowerPoint. He preferred a whiteboard, not because he was afraid of PowerPoint, but because he saw PowerPoint as an inflexible teaching tool, and also a potential distraction.

Towards the end of our second interview, Bert talked about his overall interest in technology and his occasional openness to being seduced by it. For example, Bert discussed seeking out the forty-eight frames per second version of the popular *The Hobbit* film. So, while he wanted to make himself open to the experience of being wooed by technology, it happened rarely. Technology was always present for Bert, of course – just slightly invisible. Bert could be drawn in by a variety of things, saying:

> Its receptiveness as sort of that any time that there is a little light bulb that goes on and says this piece of media speaks to me - it's like trusting that instinct if that means that at this point in my career I will have something to say about that. And so it's just being open and receptive to – and that touched something that there's a deep core drive that I can talk about.

Bert saw some challenges with technology, particularly in his field. He noted:

> Yeah, well the challenge for all of us in my field is the fact that we do presentations in a variety of physical environments. And so coming up with the ability to do – to show clips in a variety of environments is a challenge. And so I can't tell you how many people in my field I've seen sort of gum up presentations because they're essentially just working on a different physical platform that they've done before. And so it is difficult

> and full of all kinds of technical challenges and you need backups and multiple versions, and all those sorts of things. And so that, from my field in particular, is a real challenge.

Formatting issues presented a potential stumbling block, and while it was something that Bert had overcome, he saw it as a problem for many teachers in his field.

Bert was very interested in computer games, and was especially interested in the experience of playing computer games. It was less about the flashy technology of the game and more about the possible narratives and experiences that the game might bring about. Technology served as the vehicle for what actually piqued his interest.

For Bert, his teacher self was quite strong but not necessarily his authentic self. Instead, Bert considered his teaching personality a part of a performative act that required skill, practice, and perhaps the shutting down of other aspects of his being. Bert seemed to question whether anything could truly be authentic in the classroom. Bert felt that technology didn't really add or take away from the authenticity of his performance of the interactions in his classroom. For Bert, teaching was a kind of performance art – but one that improved with practice and reflection. While technology could enhance a performance, it could just as easily distort it. In his own words, "good teaching is always individual and bad teaching is always the same." This is a powerful statement suggesting that Bert recognized bad teaching as something that always looked or felt the same – something that was immediately recognizable despite the tools, technologies, or instructional approaches used -- while good teaching came in a variety of forms that could not be easily surmised. For Bert, good teaching took time to recognize, and he was open to various approaches to teaching, recognizing the complex nature of what it meant

to teach. Bert rejected a standardized conformist idea of teacher experience and instead believed that the best teachers flourish when their individuality was allowed to come forth in the classroom, on the page, and through various media. This seemed closely associated with his belief that teaching was a performance. An individual experience such as teaching was not easily generalized, because one approached it from a unique perspective of performativity. He played his teacher role to the best of his ability. Bert also said that when a student takes a class with him, it is a class in "Bert," suggesting that a teacher's personality blends with the teaching material and whatever technology is being used.

Bert frequently referenced his need for a kind of organic control over the flow of his class and that this unrestricted control helped him to be a better teacher. He also expressed concern over technologies that limited his ability to shift, change direction, and follow an impromptu path in his classroom. Bert was also comfortable putting the map aside, following his intuition, using his senses, and sharing the responsibility of guidance with his students. Bert's destination as a teacher was somewhere over there, but he was less concerned about the path he and his students traveled to reach it. Bert used the word 'organic' several times in an attempt to convey the unpredictable possibilities of impassioned teaching. While some technologies offered a chance to enhance this, Bert felt that good teaching was more likely to be hampered by technology than enhanced. His preference for a whiteboard and markers at a time when projectors and PowerPoint were more prevalent (even pervasive), showed that he was committed to his teaching ideals.

Bert also suggested that professors had to find a way to be 'good enough' at their various academic roles. He had, in a sense, developed a kind of balancing act between

these multiple, overlapping roles. By determining a level of 'good enough' for each role, no single role was neglected. All get adequate nourishment and exposure, even if one was preferred over another. Bert believed that academics that put too much emphasis on a single academic role were less likely to get tenure.

Bert's teaching style had evolved over the past several years. He wanted to approach a more alternative style of teaching that was similar to what he thought of as coaching. Bert wanted to make sure that I did not confuse his reference to coaching as an indicator that he was a jock. Still, Bert thought that teachers had a lot to learn from what athletic coaches did with their athletes:

> Coaching is done with a small group whereas teaching tends to be done…softly – coaching is at times combative and drop and write me twenty pages, there a bit more of in your faceness with coaching. I've grown to understand how athletics serves as a really pretty good model toward development, one that I have not taken myself but have grown to really appreciate.

As Bert talked about his thoughts on what it might mean to be an academic coach, he took great pains to differentiate the purpose of an academic coach from what some might call a life coach. For Bert, being a coach in the academic sense meant that you showed some tough love towards those you coached, but it was also a kind of mentorship. It was a mentoring that was personal without being overly intimate or soft. Bert seemed to think that he might have a teaching style or teaching personality that lent itself to such an approach. He did not see himself as a warm and fuzzy teacher, but rather as someone who kept a safe distance. Bert even talked about how he believed his students experienced him

as teacher, saying, “I can imagine that most of my students think of me as a relatively pleasant person, but not a warm, paternal person.” This statement suggested that Bert was mindful of the dividing lines between being a professional teacher or professor, being a friend to his students, and being a kind of father figure to them. For Bert, being a teacher did not mean being a father. He also said that he maintained a Facebook page (and was even encouraged to do so by his department), but that he was mindful of whom he ‘friended’ on Facebook. He said it was something he generally used with only his best graduate students. Such wariness indicated that Bert seemed to be cautious about presenting himself as a public figure. In interviews, he would also quickly inform me when I was taking the conversation in a direction that made him feel uncomfortable. He carefully maintained boundaries.

Bert acknowledged that his experience as a teacher was perhaps his most prevalent academic experience, not only because it occupied the majority of his time, but because most people understood (if even in a very limited sense) what a teacher was supposed to be. While Bert embraced his teacher experience and derived satisfaction and pleasure from it, teaching was not necessarily the thing he was most proud of in his professional life.

Bert suggested that it would be difficult -- or even impossible -- to locate and identify an authentic ‘teacher’ self. Instead, Bert believed that being a teacher was to be a performer; when he wrote an academic paper, that too was a kind of performance, in that he was using his academic performer self. Bert considered these selves as characters that he stepped into as he prepared to perform each character’s unique duties. Bert allowed these characters to influence and shape each other in positive ways. For example, Bert

may not have gotten academic recognition for his artistic works, but the practice of working on and creating these artistic works influenced his scholarly output. He accepted the dividing line that ran between his academic self and artistic self. In fact, it almost seemed like Bert kept a mental spreadsheet with separate columns, with certain activities going into the academic/scholarly column and other activities into the creative/artistic column. Behind the scenes of the spreadsheet, these characters shared stories over a cup of coffee, but were not seen together in public. He was uninterested in making a case for blurring the lines, but instead acknowledged what was acceptable and unacceptable for each character. The criteria through which he rated these activities was not of his own making, but was the criteria used by the academy. He accepted these criteria and did not seem interested in questioning them, nor in tearing down the walls that separated them. He used his time to work within these guidelines and did not worry about whether or not fellow academics would make judgments about him for spending too much time on creative endeavors. In some ways, it seemed as though Bert saw his academic self and his creative self as two separate individuals with two very different personalities. They met in secret to discuss ideas and exchange theories, but when they went to do their work, they kept their collaboration secret. One particularly telling quote from Bert described this complicated separation:

> The person I am in class is not authentic Bert. It's a character that I created and my character is different if I'm in grad scenarios versus the one if I'm in upper level undergrad such as if I'm doing large lecture things. You get a slice of me that's available through that medium. And so you get a slice

> of me if you're my Facebook friend. It's just its impression management on all sides of that.

In our interviews Bert would put forward the face of the teacher, but other characters emerged; there were moments where he slipped into other selves, showing how important they were to him personally and professionally. For example, when I asked him about the thing he was most proud of in his long list of professional accomplishments, he paused to consider the question carefully. After a long and thoughtful exhale, he described his pride in building, shaping and establishing the PhD program in his department. He mentioned colleagues with whom he worked with on the development project, and it was clear he took considerable pride in making his mark on the program. Bert felt that his work on this project would perhaps have the longest lasting impact on his department. While this kind of work fell under the general umbrella of scholarly work, it was based on his administrative rather than teaching or publishing duties. It is interesting that Bert discussed this aspect of his professional experience, as, for the most part, Bert did not speak much about the administrative and service requirements of his job. However, he made it clear that crafting the PhD program was something to which he was happy to contribute. He also spoke of the pleasure he took in evaluating the work of his peers when they went up for tenure. He took this task seriously, and though he acknowledged the time consuming nature of the doing the work, it was work that brought satisfaction.

Bert saw his academic role as carrying multiple citizenships, saying:

> You have to kind of decide. You can be a citizen of the field – so your peeps can be the people that you go to conferences with and you become sort of really connected at the national or international level and maybe

> not so deeply connected at the level of your own home institution. You can become a kind of citizen of the institution, and I think you can become a kind of citizen of the department. And all three of those are very different citizenships.

Bert believed that academics had to make a decision early on about which citizenship they would pursue, and that this decision had long lasting career consequences. Bert was quick to note that any of the citizenships could, by itself, "suck you dry." And he said that to pursue all of them was a kind of career suicide, but perhaps more importantly, a kind of mental and social suicide as well. Of course, this sense making was strongly influenced by the academy that shaped so much of his work and life. Bert's articulation of these citizenships spoke to the complexity of his experience, and how decisions made early in one's career could have a permanent influence on career outcomes. Bert's citizenship management was an important part of his experience with success.

Bert was uneasy with how technologies allowed people to respond thoughtlessly and anonymously. When talking about his experience being 'flamed' by colleagues and even students, he showed a genuine distrust for how some technologies (such as discussion boards or listservs) were used. He was quick to point out that it was not the technologies that necessarily caused these problems, rather the way human beings used them. It was difficult to use electronic mediums for the kind of deep, thoughtful dialogue that should occur among scholars. Bert discussed the importance of mindfully reflecting on and examining one's thoughts before putting them out into the world, and believed that well educated people such as college professors were just as susceptible to posting mean or poorly thought-out comments as anyone else. Bert cautioned his students about putting

their immediate reactions to something on the Internet, suggesting that part of his job was to train his graduate students how to think through something carefully before committing to a comment or idea. Bert shared a story about a recent experience in which a leading figure in his field had made controversial comments about a particular piece of media and how his colleagues had been decisive and quick in their judgment of him. Perhaps two weeks after most of the inflammatory comments had been made, Bert weighed in thoughtfully. This illustrated Bert's level of control and the careful maintenance of his public image.

This outlook connected with another one of Bert's experiences when he worked as a graduate student for a respected journal. In his position with the journal, he got to read a variety of scholarly submissions, many of which came from leaders in his field. Bert commented on how the initial quality of the manuscripts often seemed to be rather low; however, once they were thoughtfully reviewed and critiqued, most eventually turned into excellent scholarly articles. Bert was bringing light to his belief that it took time and effort to make something worthwhile, and that things often worked better when groups collaborated and worked together. Bert's experience revolved around a spirit of cooperation and camaraderie with his peers. He saw himself as part of a larger community of scholars who depended on each other for support. Bert clearly wanted to contribute to this scholarly community and saw himself as a part of the whole. By establishing this connection with the broader community of scholars, his experience was enhanced. Bert was protective of his community, and wanted others to value and nurture it. As Bert nurtured the community, the community nurtured him. This reciprocal

exchange brought him much satisfaction and intrinsic joy. It was also an important component to his overall academic experience.

Bert also pointed towards an important characteristic in his writing when he said,

> I consider my primary professional achievement to be discarding the weight of theory and jargon when it's not useful, and then to take the really useful parts of that and try to make it as approachable as I can.

Bert acknowledged his roots, suggesting that he was not ashamed of speaking plainly to get his point across even though he was fully capable of making something lengthy, verbose, and vexing. Bert was happy to make the complex simple, accessible to whomever should read his writing. This approach spoke to his teaching philosophy as well.

Bert had experienced change in his time as a professor; however, the most significant changes were not necessarily directly tied to technology. The changes brought about by technology tended to be subtle and not particularly disruptive in his lifeworld. He asserted that, "No one is controlled by their technologies" and was comfortable managing technology and not letting technology manage him. Bert talked extensively about his growing desire to do more creative kinds of work. While Bert certainly thought that this creative work would inform his scholarly work, he understood that it would not be accepted by the academic community. He seemed to be at a life stage where his focus was shifting away from the traditional researcher role and moving more towards the role of an artist. Certain kinds of technology were making it slightly easier for him to do this artistic work. Thus, technology was a modest enhancer of what was possible in his creative work, but not as a main catalyst. Once again, Bert made choices about

technology based on whether or not it would enhance his work. Bert gingerly spoke about this slow ongoing change and what it meant:

> Academia can take over your life. There is always something that you should be doing. There's a book you should be reading, there's an article you should be reading, there's new materials you should be working on for your classes, there's publications that you should be working on yourself, there's committee work. And so academia – there is not end to it. It is fifteen different siren voices saying you're not doing what you should be doing on this arena if you are doing that. And so it is a bottomless pit of a thing.

Bert benefited from this realization early in his career, accepting that there would never be enough time to do everything, especially everything that the academy wanted. This realization allowed him to carve out time to nourish his creative life, and this soulful nourishment was now bearing fruit. Bert was very clear about his experience with his creative work, praising it for enriching his scholarly work. Still, he had no illusions that the academy had any interest in his creative work, nor did he concern himself with whether his creative work would bring him academic recognition.

Bert said:

> As we get more comfortable with our tablets and with virtual manipulation and photo shopping and whatever else ya wanna do, there can be something that's newly reinvigorating about physical tactility. And I understand that the digital technologies are tactile technologies, and you touch the tablet but it's easy to not think of them as being tactile.

Bert was quick to mention the undeniable impact that technology has on expectations in his work. He suggested that as technology became more and more sophisticated and powerful, administrative forces in the academy had higher and higher expectations about what could and should be done with data. Bert talked specifically about how time consuming his work could be as his department's Director of Graduate Studies. While he thought of the work as satisfying, he remembered that with each year he did it, the expectations seemed to increase within his department. Incidentally, Bert held this position before, during, and after his tenure. His thoughts on the position were complicated. It was obvious that he cared about the work, but acknowledged the time commitment required to do it well.

Bert saw one aspect of technology as effecting perhaps the biggest change on what it means to teach. He described his experience growing up in the rural southeastern US, and how there was so little access to many kinds of media. For example, Bert passionately described a broadcast of Shakespeare via public television that he saw as a young person:

> Oh my god, any chance to see a Royal Shakespeare Company version of Shakespeare, and you're just not going to get that in a town of two thousand people and two stop lights, and so just the enormous access that you come into really means that you have a lot more to grab from in making an identity for yourself as an individual I think.

He also mentioned that he had not seen a foreign film until he was in college. Bert saw an important sea change in almost all the university's students' having access to seemingly

unlimited information via the Internet. Bert no longer felt it was the teacher's job to ensure that students had access to content. In his own words:

> I think that exposure is less a crucial part of that [teaching] because of that access. And so it becomes more, really more focused on working through what you do with that material. And so I think as a teacher it's less – it's not about exposing people to new things but it's about, that exposure is less the driving concern.

This revelation spoke to more than merely flipping the classroom, but for Bert, entailed a larger change in his experience as a professional educator. It created larger gaps between students who had taken the time to immerse themselves in media and those who had not. Bert had less patience for students who did not see the importance of familiarizing themselves with much of the media in their field but also acknowledged that we lived in a media-saturated time. Students needed guidance in selecting certain pieces from certain fields, but as the field expanded, it became harder for students and faculty to zero in on what was important. It also became difficult to find common ground with the students. Bert liked the challenge, and felt liberated by not having to spend so much class time introducing students to various media. Instead, he used class time to host lively conversations. Bert grew up in a time of media scarcity and was teaching in a time of media saturation. Bert experienced this access as a gift, but thought students took this access for granted.

Summary

Bert's faculty experience was complicated and involved; however, he did not necessarily think of technology as a driving force in his experience, particularly over the

past ten years. Instead, technology encouraged mostly modest changes to his professional lifeworld. Bert took an engaged stance when negotiating professional identities, choosing the appropriate one to put forward at any given time. Bert made conscious decisions throughout his career that formally and informally shaped his experience.

The experience of earning an undergraduate degree in technology and then working in the field of technology gave him a very practical approach to using technology. One cannot overstate the importance of Bert's early technology experience in shaping his experience as a professor. Bert described himself as a "grounded gadfly" who enjoyed many different subjects and fields. These experiences gave him insight and abilities that deepened his experience. Bert was amused by the chatter about technology. He was interested in it only so far as it helped him in his work as teacher, scholar, or artist. Technology was simply a supporting actor in his lifeworld.

This pragmatic approach to technology was shaped by his working class upbringing. Technology was a tool. Bert's teaching was also pragmatic as he approached it from the middle and for the middle. Bert had a certain ambivalence towards technology. He did not resist it, but instead allowed it to appear when appropriate. He considered technology an essential part of the lifeworld of almost all his students and had no interest in trying to control it, promote it, or inhibit it. Bert seemed to focus his teaching energies on working within the lifeworld of which he was a part, and if that lifeworld included technology, that was fine. Bert found his experience with PowerPoint to be restrictive, preventing him from easily moving in an impromptu way from one topic to another. He did not resist technology per se, but instead resisted anything that might limit what he could do while teaching. He did not care for predetermined paths.

Bert did not feel compelled to always be available to his colleagues or students. While he was conscious of responding in a timely manner to e-mails, he did not feel a need to respond immediately. Bert addressed the importance of being timelier in getting student assignments back, and suggested that technology played a role in setting the expectations of students. He suggested that technology may hold some faculty accountable for being more mindful in getting feedback to students. Bert saw technology as a kind of tool that had eliminated many excuses that he and his students may have used in the past. Bert liked the transparency but was cautious about some of the side effects. Bert was not intimidated by personal or instructional technologies: he simply made a conscious evaluation of whether or not the technology in question would be useful to him, and then decided to implement it or not.

Table 4. Bert's Codes

Waste of time	Technology seen as a…Too often it is a…
Practicality	Does this fit my style? What does this do better than what I am already doing?
Black hole	Working in the academy…no end to the required work…all consuming…
Longevity	What long will this last? What is the shelf life?
Good teaching	Differentiated from bad teaching…individual style
PowerPoint	Too restrictive, forced pathways, used too often
Seduction	Wants to be seduced, but rarely is
Publish	High achievement, questioning what to publish next
DGS	Director of Graduate Studies
Shaping	Proud moment, the significance of having a positive influence
Coach	Tough love approach to teaching, drill sergeant
Internet	Biggest change to his identity as a teacher

Chapter Five

Patricia

> I don't consider myself to be particularly tech savvy. I think that it would be advantageous to me if I were. But it's kind of, well, it's just not my priority and I don't have time for things that are not a priority.
>
> Patricia

> Life is either too empty or too full. Happily, I never cease to transmit these curious damaging shocks. At 46, I am not callous; suffer considerably; make good resolutions – still feel as experimental and on the verge of getting at the truth as ever.
>
> (Woolf, Bell, Bell, & McNeillie, 1977, p. 180)

Introducing Patricia

Patricia's perception of her primary professional self was very complex. Her early experience as a faculty member revolved around being well prepared for her duties as a teacher in the classroom. She said,

> At some point in my first several years of teaching, I guess, I realized that my fall back in my early years of teaching was, I wanted to be really well prepared for every class, which often had a lot to do with just knowing the text really well and having prepared a lot of questions that I wanted to ask well. I would definitely go over everything right before class and stuff like that, which I still do.

Patricia's felt that preparation was perhaps the most important thing she could do for a class, and this preparation involved a thorough analysis and re-reading of whatever text was to be discussed. Even though Patricia was an experienced teacher at this point in her career, she still considered this kind of preparation important, but perhaps not as important as she first thought. In her own words:

> At some point, I realized that how well prepared I was in terms of the detail in my notes, or how well I remembered every detail in my notes, might have less to do with the success of the session. What might be more important could be my own sense of a goal for that class and a goal for the semester for the class. I decided to represent that with the image of a ship. I was trying to convey the idea of being buried in the text, versus thinking about teaching more as a leadership role. Thinking about a class, either one class session or an entire semester, as more of a journey that I'm leading the class through. I didn't intentionally go looking for a cruise ship but when I saw that image, I liked it because I thought of ports.

In speaking about her early experience in preparing for class, Patricia said,

> I don't think that I ever felt totally drowned in it or totally overwhelmed, but I definitely in my first couple of years of teaching, felt more nervous just going into the classroom than I did later.

One might say that the text was a central part of her teaching in that she spent so much time with it. Patricia continued to spend time with various texts today, but she had removed the blinders that the text might have placed on her. For Patricia, this shift towards a more facilitated experience in the classroom only arrived after several years of

being slightly uncomfortable there. S While her level of discomfort was not debilitating or demobilizing, it served as a motivator to work hard. Over time, her foundation in teaching and instruction solidified.

Patricia made a graceful move from being a novice teacher to an expert. Part of that process was discovering what kind of approach worked best for her in the classroom. Before coming to this university, Patricia taught for four years at a small liberal arts college. She also attended a small liberal arts college for her undergraduate degree. She very much enjoyed the environment of a small college and was afraid that her teaching style would not translate well to a large urban research university; however, she told me her fears were unfounded. Her teaching style continued to work here, just as it did at the smaller college. What had changed was how comfortable she was with teaching. It was something that had become much more natural to her, but had taken several years of work and practice. Teaching had been a secondary consideration as she pursued her PhD. Research had been at the forefront of her mind, and while she appreciated teaching and the rewards it brought, research her passion. During member checking, Patricia suggested that these feelings seemed to change from week to week, especially the longer she did her work. While it might have been the research aspect that brought into her work, it was perhaps the teaching aspect that kept her there.

Patricia appreciated the stability and job security that tenure brought to her professional and personal life; however, once she had tenure, it was difficult for her to think about the tenure process. Because she taught for four years at another university (in a non-tenure track position) she felt she had already learned the political ropes of the tenure process. In her words, by the time she got to the tenure process, she felt like “she

was already there." In this study, Patricia had a unique attitude towards tenure. It was as if tenure was a given for her, and that she never had any serious doubts about whether or not she would be awarded tenure. This assurance was likely due Patricia's more relaxed outlook on life rather than arrogance.

Timing had a large part to play in Patricia's tenure process. She said,

> I thought I wanted to land in a tenure-track job before I had kids and then that just took longer than I thought it would and we kind of gave up and went ahead before I had a tenure-track job. That ended up being kind of good for me in the sense that in those years between finishing my dissertation and having kids and then having my first child and then getting a job, I did have some productive time here I had like a post-doc and I had relatively large amounts of time to work on my stuff. I had things that had come out or that were in the pipeline and that made the tenure process less stressful for me.

For Patricia, even though the timing of big life events did not initially work out quite like she had planned, there were some benefits to the flow of her life events. One of the benefits was that her tenure process was perhaps less stressful than what she might have otherwise experienced. Perhaps this less stressful process was something that contributed to her self-confidence and unconcerned attitude. Or perhaps this was simply Patricia's approach to her work. She pointed out that once tenure was established, she had a different set of priorities:

> At this point, having tenure, I don't think too much about…beside the fact that I just have to teach my two classes a semester, I'm not needing to

> really worry about like what are my evaluations and is that going to make a difference for my advancement. I'm not really thinking about that so much as I'm just thinking about wanting to do a decent job because I have a classroom of students and I don't want to let them down.

So even though Patricia did not have to worry very much about the financial markets, enrollment, or even teaching evaluations, she still wanted to do a good job of teaching because she did not want to disappoint her students. If she was going to do something, she wanted to do a good job

The university where Patricia worked did not have a well-funded sabbatical program to support tenured faculty for extended research projects. For someone like Patricia, who was ambitious, prolific and committed to her field, this lack of support sometimes worked as a de-motivator. Her timing in the tenure process did not match up with some of the newly implemented sabbatical policies. Patricia felt this lack of research support hurt her ability to do the kind of work she wanted to do. She said,

> I'm trying to get a new project off the ground. I've started a new project which is like my third project, but I want this to be a big book project and I don't have any kind of automatic sabbatical, so that's something that definitely I have feelings about and I'm frustrated that this university doesn't give automatic sabbaticals because I need that time to do this project in a way that I feel will really be my next big thing and go to the next level.

This frustration also stemmed from the push from the university for all faculty to do more research without funding. Patricia wanted to move from Associate to Full Professor but knew it would be difficult without support. She saw some of the new policies for third and fifth year Associate Professors as a good thing, but the timing of her tenure caused her to miss the three year window. She was hopeful that she would get a semester sabbatical, but it was not guaranteed. She was also mindful of the difficulty of getting research funding, acknowledging the competitive nature of grants. Patricia knew there were no promises in her field and said,

> I should be able to get some time off if I get a grant funded. It's just really competitive right now in terms of the funding like NSF and so, from what I understand, several years ago it was the case that if you had gotten tenure and you were submitting grants, even if they didn't come through you'd get some kind of time off for sort of having put out the effort and done as much as you've already done, but that's not the case anymore.

Patricia wanted to move forward and seemed to have the will to do so. Whether or not she would receive the support she needed from the university was still up in the air.

Patricia's Technology and Teaching Experience

Patricia saw herself as less than tech savvy. She believed that more adeptness or interest in the use of technology would be beneficial for her career. While Patricia did not feel a particularly combative relationship with technology, she usually felt the technologies she encountered were not conducive to her teaching style. She said,

> I feel like what I'm trying to do with my teaching is not necessarily served by technology. I do think that I could discover more ways to use

> technology, and then they would and it would serve. But fundamentally, I think my approach to teaching as it relates to technology, has not changed a whole lot.

As Patricia continued talking about her experience, she acknowledged the role that technology played in her university, saying:

> I've become more and more aware of how technology is important in the university, in a university like this, that's big where they focused on technology as a positive thing. I mean, sometimes, I wonder how useful it is, especially if they (students) haven't taken that many upper level classes yet. But for me, I don't think that it's central to what I'm doing and therefore I don't have time for it.

For Patricia, time was a central determining factor for whatever she decided to do in class. Her perception was that learning technologies (or just technologies that might be used in learning situations) were time consuming to learn how to operate and were probably not a very good fit with her teaching style. She knew that many faculty members got attention for technology implementation in their classes, but she was rarely moved to try it.

Patricia believed that classes should happen in person, rather than online. At the same time, she recognized that she might have unjustifiable biases against online teaching and learning. Patricia never taught an online course and had mixed feelings about it. She said,

> I would be hesitant to say that there's something about teaching that absolutely can't be delivered in an online forum or something; certainly, if you're talking about some kind of huge lecture class that's pretty

> impersonal. Maybe in some way, it's not really that much of a leap to just go ahead and deliver it as a package in an online way. For me, anyway, there's so much about the classroom experience that is not determined by the modules that you're trying to deliver but that is enriched by the situation of interaction itself. Interaction happens online too…but my fear is that a lot of them will be watered down and just devoid of that more social context that I think is important.

While Patricia valued the social aspect of her teaching, she was cautious about making herself overly available to students. Patricia did not have a smartphone, but she did have a basic cell phone. When she talked about whether or not she was comfortable with students calling or texting her, she was very cautious. She briefly mentioned one instance when a graduate student had her cell phone number, but such information exchanges were the exception and not the rule. When Patricia looked to the future of higher education, she believed that it would be commonplace for professors to put their cell phone numbers on the syllabus, and that institutions might soon require it. Though she believed her department would be one of the last to implement such a thing, she was quick to point out that her department already encouraged more communication between faculty and students. Patricia saw that, as academia moved into online or virtual spaces, more and more faculty-student interaction would be expected and she felt that she was powerless to change it. She also wanted to be mindful of her bias against such things. She questioned whether or not there was a reason to resist, or whether or not she should just try to find ways to make this work for her. She did not resist technology because she saw it as something evil or destructive; instead, she felt she was resisting something that

slowly crept into her life to steal her time. Patricia seemed especially sensitive about making sure her students had authentic face-to-face social experiences as part of their learning.

From a practical standpoint, Patricia used e-mail as a primary communication tool with her students and fellow faculty. Patricia said,

> The fact that I do so much of keeping up with things by e-mail, that students contact me, that I get back to them, that, you know, I let people know what they are supposed to be doing by e-mail, or schedule meetings by e-mail, or whatever. Sometimes the faculty will discuss things via e-mail as opposed to having meetings. The fact that I can do all those things from home, at any time, makes it more feasible for me not to be here. But at the same time, it probably kind of blurs things in a sense that when I am at home I'm not really, totally, on my own time in my own mind, because I am being responsive remotely to things.

E-mail was a primary tool for Patricia, something she could not imagine being without. Patricia was quick to note that the pervasiveness of e-mail cut into her time at home, where her time did not belong entirely to her. She appreciated the convenience of technology, but resisted its ubiquitous presence.

Besides e-mail, Patricia saw the Internet in general as providing more and better professional communication options. When she talked about the changes that the Internet had brought in how she interacted with colleagues at other institutions, she seemed mostly pleased with the changes, saying:

> There's so much we can do now in terms of things like professional networking and communication that 20 years ago would have been very different. I think back then you would have just needed to go to conferences and you would maybe succeed in meeting somebody or you wouldn't. You probably wouldn't pick up the phone and call someone you didn't know and say 'hey, I'm interested in your work' or something like that. E-mail facilitates that. So, I mean, that's a huge boon.

When Patricia talked about the sense of community in her field, it was clear that the Internet and digital communication tools played a large role. In fact, during the course of our interviews, Patricia joined Facebook at least partially to stay in touch with certain people in her field. She also used Facebook to follow organizations in her field. Patricia resisted social media at first, but came to see it as something that might enhance her ability to network and share ideas. She was still extremely cautious in how she used certain tools, but suspected that she would come to use them more.

For Patricia, digital research and communication tools had changed where she did her work. Though Patricia once spent a lot of time in the library, she visited much less frequently at the time of interview. This ease of access was still a surprise to her:

> One thing that often strikes me as how amazing it is, is being able to access so many academic sources just from a café. Like the fact that I can be putting together a bibliography and just sit in the coffee shop and research it and put it together and really have it done without having to go to a library, is, um, is really good. Or if I am thinking about an area of research and I don't have a strong knowledge of the research in that area I

> can start googling it and find stuff, some of which I can read right from my screen. So that's a huge advantage.

As Patricia talked about this ease of access, she mentioned that this may have also changed her expectations in writing research. She felt that expectations for the literature review were ever expanding. She talked about how doing research on some topics once required a trip to the Library of Congress, and that those kinds of trips might have changed expectations in that not everyone could make it to the physical location where something was housed. With almost everything available online, she was unsure how researchers should manage the information. Patricia framed this experience in terms of time. For her, it was unclear whether this ease of access gave her additional time (not having to travel to the library, but doing research from home) or took more time in that expectations had changed, and readers expected you to cover every possible study in the literature review.

Patricia was not enamored with PowerPoint. While she saw it as a possible tool for showing something that was highly visual, she generally saw it as a distraction. She saw herself as someone outside the norm in this regard, believing that most of her colleagues used PowerPoint very often. Patricia said,

> For the most part I don't use it because – and I know I get annoyed going to faculty meetings or departments meetings where really the attention is so focused on the PowerPoint, sometimes they'll give you a PowerPoint, I mean a hard copy of it at the start of the presentation, and you feel like you can get the gist of it by just skimming the PowerPoint handout, and so why am I going to have to sit here for 45 minutes?

Again Patricia pointed to a dissipation of her time. She seemed to suggest that we were in a culture where PowerPoint was expected, even if it was superfluous. For someone with a large research agenda and two classes to teach per semester, wasting time sitting in a presentation where the information could have been disseminated in an e-mail or memo was very frustrating. In the classroom, Patricia saw PowerPoint as restrictive:

> It doesn't fit with the way I teach because most of the time, I mean, there may be some background information that I want students to get but I'm normally not presenting something that totally pre-exists the interaction in the classroom. I'm usually working students through a text or a set of texts where there definitely are some key points or arguments that I want them to come away with but I don't actually know where the conversation is going to go before it starts. Not only because I don't know what everybody in the room is going to say, but also because I work interactively and try to pull out from the group a set of positions or a set of debates that I can't totally predict, but really, I want something that is more fluid.

Patricia also thought that PowerPoint gave students a false sense of what information was most important and what they should then study. Because Patricia preferred her students make these decisions for themselves, she did not want to use any kind of teaching tool that pushed them towards a particular way of thinking. She also wanted to avoid being pushed to use technology for the wrong reasons. Patricia said:

> I am not opposed to technology, I think there are probably a lot of great things that I could do but that I am not doing, and um, but at the same time

> it is disappointing me that the main message from the university is that improving technology pedagogy is about technology. I don't think that that is what it is all about. Maybe it makes us look more sophisticated that we have all these technologies but I don't think that says anything directly about the quality of teaching.

Patricia mentioned that she might feel very differently about PowerPoint if she taught more undergraduate classes and made a connection between the use of technology and the dissemination of information to large groups of students. For Patricia, there was an important difference between disseminating information and teaching.

In graduate school, Patricia focused on practicing as a researcher as opposed to teaching others how to do research. She was drawn to the literature of her field, and was especially drawn to being a practitioner and participating in the work. While she did teach classes as a graduate student (and felt comfortable doing so), the teaching part of her professional life seemed like a distant second place to what she really wanted to do. She felt split between the world of teaching and the world of hands-on practice in her field. When I asked Patricia how she might describe what she did for a living to someone she just met at a cocktail party, she had this to say:

> I guess I could see going either way. When somebody asks me about my professional identity and maybe I'm talking about being a Generic Researcher and what that means more than about being a professor in terms of being a teacher. But at the same time, the day-to-day reality is often being a teacher. Also, being a college teacher is something that is maybe more identifiable for a lot of people. But usually, that kind of

> questions gets me to talking more about being a Generic Researcher, just in terms of being a researcher or what kind of approach do I take or what kinds of topics I am interested in.

These comments suggested that Patricia did not necessarily think of her primary academic experience as teaching, even if the majority of her work hours were spent towards that end. Because people may be more likely to relate to her as a teacher (or professor), she naturally drifted towards that title in casual conversation. In my conversations with Patricia, it was clear that she was passionate about her research. She valued teaching, but it was not always the thing that most motivated her: she felt pulled by her desire to be a teacher and her desire to be a researcher, ideally one with a list of important and noted publications, and some degree of autonomy.

Early on, Patricia did not fully grasp just how much teaching would be a part of her experience once she finished graduate school. She said:

> I went into grad school, I think, knowing but not really fully internalizing that when you go to get a doctorate, a big part of your job ends up being a teacher. I didn't really think about going to get a doctorate to be a teacher. I thought about becoming a researcher and of course, being an academic has a lot to do with being a teacher and you actually spend a lot of your time being a teacher.

Patricia's teacher self was rooted in the experience of thoughtful conversation, reflection, and a creative sense-making process that occurred when people shared ideas. For Patricia, this meant having long, intimate face-to-face conversations in small groups. Patricia valued the richness that classroom social interactions brought to her lifeworld.

When I asked whether winning the lottery would cause her to give up teaching altogether, she said:

> No, I don't think I would. Right now in my career I'm feeling a lot like I would really like a sabbatical to work on my research so my first thing would be to take off like a year or two, but after that I think that I would want to teach exactly for, or, in connection to those issues, those things I care about in my research. Having the freedom to do that on my own schedule would be awesome, but I do think that it would get lonely and feel sort of, I'm not sure that it's so important to me that I would want to take away that kind of everyday social contact.

Patricia was aware, then, of the important part that social interaction plays in her teaching, and she believed that even if she were not required to teach, she would still want to do so. Financial freedom might release her from the obligation of teaching, but she derived a value from teaching that transcended the monetary. This confirmed that teaching remained an important social experience. When Patricia talked about the value she got from the socialization of her classroom, she did not mention that technology (including social media) contributed to her experience. She did, however, say,

> I tend to think of it in my own mind that teaching is kind of, less prestigious but more real, like more human, more immediate. Where I can publish an article and maybe get a reader or not, but it's somehow kind of out there, and the satisfaction that I get from it maybe has to do with, in some more abstract way, like knowing I'm doing well in my career or I

> haven't published anything lately or whatever. But teaching is filled with many more kinds of smaller satisfactions – it is more immediate.

Because the immediacy of communication with students was usually a pleasant experience for Patricia, it might seem surprising that she was not more open to digital communication methods – after all, digital communication would likely usher in more pathways for students to touch base with her. However, because Patricia was protective of her time, she limited outside interactions with students. While Patricia enjoyed the interactions with students, these interactions were unlikely to be helpful to her professionally. She commented about this from time to time in our conversations. When member checking this paragraph, Patricia commented with the following:

> And I don't think it's unusual for profs to talk this way amongst themselves. I was just really honest with you, I guess! My point in bringing this kind of thing up is that our resources (time and energy) are limited, and it's frustrating when things that are important to us in a human way (like helping out a student with something) seem undervalued/underrecognized by the university in its scheme of "productivity." So you basically have to follow your own moral compass when you make choices about how to spend your time. I wasn't meaning to say that I didn't care about those things b/c they don't advance my career; rather, that I do care about them, and that it's frustrating that sometimes one must choose between spending time with students or doing what will get one good professional development reviews (b/c there may not be time for both).

The stereotype of academics not having motivation or drive was proven completely false for Patricia. In fact, the professors in this study were all motivated; however, their motivations, drivers, and goals were diverse. Patricia never really wanted to be a teacher–teaching was just part of the career package. Her spectrum of experience with teaching ranged from enjoyment and delight to tolerance, from tolerance to rare annoyance, but the experience was not the focus of her professional life.

When doing the member checking process, Patricia was surprised to see how much she differentiated between her experience as a teacher and her experience as a researcher. She wanted to make sure I understood that she definitely saw herself as a teacher and tried to explain it this way:

> I think your analysis makes sense, and I wonder what other faculty said about this, because I don't think it's unusual in academia to feel this way at least in the experience of my colleagues. But maybe I've overemphasized the role of researcher in my identity…as a day-to-day employee, I'm definitely a teacher (and advisor and administrator, and to some extent researcher), but then when I think of my national network of colleagues (which I do find sustaining even if it's much less dominant in my life), it's about the research/writing/ideas.

And then she added:

> This is really interesting to read b/c I think I am somewhat ambivalent about this. I mean, I think it partly comes down to the fact that in academia, research is more highly valued (unfortunately) than teaching – or at least, your broader reputation rests on the former while your day-to-

> day interactions are much more about the latter. In some way I definitely define "success" in my "career" as more linked with research, and yet – as you discussed earlier – I still have an unshakable sense of teaching and my interactions with my students as being in some sense more "real," more on an authentic human level, and therefore more important in some sense. So the "motivation" or "passion" question is a tough one. I think research informs my more abstract sense of my career, but doing a good job in teaching is what I live from day to day, and I do see it as maybe the most important way in which I contribute to society as an academic.

Patricia enjoyed teaching, but also recognized the time drain involved with teaching, and this loss of time was something that she frequently considered. She strove to make sure that she gave her students the best possible learning experience, but doing this took time and energy that could be spent on research.

In addition to this, Patricia's biggest conflict came with being a professor and being a parent. Patricia said:

> With kids it makes it more complicated, and these coming years when my kids are still young, I really feel the lack of time. I mean, often I've thought to myself that I have something that's not too far from the kind of balance I want, but it feels hard a lot of the time to keep all the balls in the air.

Patricia told a story about a picture that one of her children had drawn of Patricia working at a computer. Patricia did not dwell on the picture, but saw the picture as a representation of her larger experience with drawing clear boundaries between work and

home life. Patricia was committed to being a mother, but was also committed to her profession. These two responsibilities frequently collided. Patricia said:

> I try to keep what I do on the computer at home to a minimum because it's challenging with the kids to do anything substantive. But of course I will check e-mail and stuff. It often happens when I've gone to check e-mail, then she'll come and she wants something else. So it seems indicative to me, maybe not all the time that I spend, although I probably spend a lot more time than I think I do, since we all do but also about what her experience was, in terms of the laptop as a competitor of her time probably.

The push and pull of technology contributed to her tug of war at home. Many technologies made it easy to check and respond to e-mail from anywhere. Patricia was aware of this, and had, at least for the time being, drawn a line in the sand regarding smartphones. Patricia said,

> I don't have a smartphone partly because I just don't feel like it's a priority. One of the things that I really am resistant about it is the idea that it would become so easy to check my e-mail at any point. Like, right now, I'll check it at home and sometimes that turns out to be kind of a tense thing if my daughter wants something or my son wants something and I'm saying, wait I just have to finish my thought in this e-mail. I find it frustrating to not finish something that I started – I want to finish the thought and get it off before I come put on your show or bring you a snack or whatever. That's often a challenging situation.

Patricia's lifeworld of a busy researcher/professor often conflicted with her lifeworld of mother, and it seemed that the experience of conflict was enhanced by technology. She wanted to please the people contacting her through e-mail, but she also wanted to be there for her children. She did not have a smartphone, so when she left the house she was no longer able to access her e-mail. If she got a smartphone (as she suggested she probably would eventually do) there may no longer be a space in which she could operate solely as a mother. Patricia mentioned the joy she found in walking with her children to school, knowing that she did not have the option of checking or responding to e-mail. For Patricia this was one of the few remaining spaces where she was not entirely reachable by her profession. The children essentially had her attention for the entire walk to school – no interruptions, no pressure to respond to something. Work was out of sight and out of mind, and Patricia could focus on the experience of being a mother.

Patricia's impressive credentials give some insight into how driven she must have been as a young graduate student. Having attended schools with stellar reputations, it made sense that she would strive to do research in her field. Patricia said:

> I was probably thinking less about a lifelong association with a specific institution so much as I was thinking about going around the world doing my own research, which I did do but in a way – that it's different – in addition to being affiliated with a university and all the stuff that that brings with it is, of course, the family part. I always expected that I would have a family, but I guess I didn't think that hard about how my research agenda and having children would intersect.

Patricia placed a lot of emphasis on being a mom, and not just a mom in title, but someone who was there for her children, even when it was inconvenient. The never-ending pressure of being a professor made her feel as though she should always be doing more (more writing, more reading, etc.). She also knew that her children were growing up. She did not want to miss these moments in their lives. This pressure never stopped. Patricia's research required long stretches of time, not only for data collection but also for writing up the results. It was easy to see how the day-to-day activities of teaching might interfere with this kind of work and with being a mother. Patricia did not want to think of her children as something that interfered with her work, but she wondered whether other people in the academy saw their children this way.

When Patricia thought about her professional self, she saw herself as a researcher before teacher; however, she recognized that others related to her teaching work. She desired a role that was more research-focused since she started her graduate work. Even when she talked about teaching as a graduate student, it was almost as an afterthought. My conversation with Patricia was a fascinating study in the complexity of what it means to be a researcher who happens to teach. While her preference seemed to shift and our talks showed how this topic was difficult for her to pinpoint, she did not want to suggest that teaching was unimportant. Patricia's data was an excellent representation of the difficulty of reconciling that disconnect between the teacher and the researcher. As time passed (particularly in the last ten years), Patricia had become more comfortable with the uneven terrain of what it meant to be both a teacher and a researcher at a research institution, accepting the occasional disconnect and navigating the shifting roles.

Patricia saw her research as informing her teaching. In fact, Patricia felt that a professor was likely to be much happier in his or her job if the roles of researcher and teacher intersected frequently. The relationship between the research and teaching was uneven in some ways, though. As Patricia stated:

> I think I tend to think about those two parts of my career as kind of complimentary. It's the stuff that you do that your colleagues around the country notice that has the prestige attached to it and that feels like it's what is supposed to be important and kind of where you make your mark and where your importance is defined, like your symbolic value or something.

Patricia derived considerable meaning from getting something published and recognized. These acknowledgements from her peers were very rewarding to her. Patricia also felt a sense of prestige from this part of her work. Patricia noted the social recognition difference between teaching and publishing. She did not want to demean teaching as a profession; however, it was obvious to her that teaching carried less prestige and therefore less clout. The experience of having something published felt more rewarding.

When this study first started, Patricia did not have a presence on Facebook. When we first talked about Facebook, Patricia seemed only mildly curious about it – suggesting that she did sometimes feel pressure to be 'out there' but that it was something she continued to put on the backburner; however, over the course of our work together, Patricia opened an account on Facebook, establishing a profile, and 'friending' people. As she put it:

> I finally felt like, okay, I guess I've got to do it. It felt kind of like a big deal, but then it just sits there. I don't do anything with it. The reality is that I didn't feel like I had time for it before, I don't feel like I have time for it now. I'm technically there, but it's not important in my life, so it's not really a big change.

Patricia told me that she did not feel our conversations had necessarily caused her to open the account because she had been thinking about opening an account long before this project started; however, in our early conversations (and throughout all the interviews) Patricia consistently gave examples of how she was mindful of being protective of her time. After revealing that she had created a Facebook presence, she said "I don't feel compelled to use it." This illustrated that Patricia was comfortable saying no to technologies that might be invasive or even addictive for other people. Patricia participated, but only under the rules and guidelines that she laid out for herself.

One change that Patricia had become increasingly aware of is the notion of students as consumers. She said,

> I do think that certainly it seems like there's a lot more or more explicit talk in academics these days about understanding your students to be your consumers. To me, that means that consumer satisfaction is a goal, which I think is closely related to successful education but not necessarily the same thing…because ideally there would be a lot of overlap because ultimately when a student has learned some things and has reflected on the fact that they've learned some things and they've experienced some kind of positive self-growth out of this process, then they'll probably have

> a sense of satisfaction and that they're pleased with the education that they got.

Patricia was cautious about linking the proliferation of technology in the academy as a direct cause of the consumerization of higher education. For Patricia, the academy itself seemed to be struggling with the change, and what it means to be a university. She conveyed her experience when starting to teach at this university:

> I remember going to one of the orientation programs when I first started working here and feeling kind of schizophrenic. One day they were focusing on professional development. The message that everybody was given was don't let your teaching take up too much of your time, make sure to carve out some days for your professional work and that's very important. Then the next day was focused on teaching and it was a different set of people differently positioned within the university talking, sometimes in a pretty explicitly way, about customer satisfaction. We talked about student evaluations and how to read them. At one point, the person who was leading the seminar said something to the effect of, like, well, how – if was something to the effect of like, well, we know that this is successful when the students say it was in the evaluation. So that was a sort of aha moment.

Patricia made sure I understood that she deeply valued feedback from her students but that the academy seemed increasingly unable to distinguish between useful feedback and rhetoric. She knew that she sometimes asked her students to do things in their assignments that were difficult or even unpleasant, and there was always the creeping

feeling that this will lead to poor evaluations. It was a delicate balance, and even though Patricia had tenure, she still felt this pressure. During the member checking, Patricia said that this had not been a significant concern for her, though she believed it is often a concern for many faculty.

Patricia was most concerned about the increasing sentiment that academia was out of touch with the real world. While she saw this as a valid complaint, she worried that critics missed the bigger picture of what academia allowed. She said:

> I definitely think that academia can be very elitist, forcing students to read about and care about things that otherwise they wouldn't care about and maybe they won't find useful later. So that's an issue but at the same time I think that the academy is also special insofar as, to some extent, we still can talk about ideas for their own sake, kind of, without having to come up with some kind of productive bottom line all the time. That means I think that things get discussed in academics that don't get discussed as much in the media or in more consumer drive markets. So, I guess, that's kind of my concern, that the more thoroughly consumer driven education becomes, the less interesting stuff will happen there.

Patricia felt only somewhat protected by these impending changes to the academy. She saw changes in how students built and formulated ideas. When talking about problems associated with plagiarism, Patricia moved the conversation to the distinct differences in how she did research when she was a graduate student and how her graduate students did research today. She focused on the availability of information and what that might mean, saying:

> I think that people who have grown up with the internet have more of a sense of all this stuff is just out there and it's floating and it's kind of free property. Why wouldn't you go look to see what people have said about it before you even start formulating an idea? I wonder if they use it in ways that kind of cut off their own thought process early. I don't want to be reactionary and say it like, it's not a valid form of knowledge because it's not the one that I was trained on in college. I think it's a different process. It's just starting to challenge our old ideas about what originality of thought is, that students are increasingly in a world where the art of finding and restitching is more what they are going to need to do, than they're kind of starting from scratch and building up an idea.

This change was clearly a point that Patricia struggled with, and when I pressed her to say whether or not she was okay with this change, she added:

> I don't think my way is inherently better in some moral sense, but in a grounded sense, I have to teach these students kind of way, I think my way is better. I do feel I can tell the difference, and really appreciate when a student has looked at what's in front of them and really thought about it and made some observations and tried to say something a little bit new.

Patricia blended her academic roles as needed, but preferred to do the blending when there was a purposeful reason to do so. It was especially satisfying for Patricia to blend her research, or research experience, with her teaching. She said:

> Increasingly, over time, I think, I guess because I spend so much time teaching, I think I have gained a more central sense of my work as a

> researcher being not just doing my own research but conveying an anthropological perspective to a lot of people through teaching.

For Patricia, finding a way to link her work as a researcher and her work as a teacher was important for her professional growth. If they existed separate from each other, each operating in a vacuum, Patricia would not find as much satisfaction in her work as either a teacher or a researcher. On the other hand, Patricia had not found a way to bridge her role as parent and professor, and could not seem to find a way the two roles could complement each other. They intersected, but did not get along. During the member check, she added:

> I don't remember if I commented on this, but I do find the flexibility of my academic position to be a huge boon as a parent. The downside is that I just try to fit in too much, but the flexibility and autonomy I have are benefits that I do value greatly and which allows me to parent in ways I want to – at least more than many working parents would be able.

Summary

Patricia was very cognizant of how she spent her time, and the question of how much time something will take to learn, to use and to incorporate were essential questions that Patricia asked of every technology that she encountered. Patricia was highly motivated and very much engrossed in her research. She was committed to being a good teacher, even when it was not the part of her professional persona with which she most identified. She liked teaching, and planned to continue teaching – even if that meant neglecting her research. Patricia thought that being a mother and being a researcher/teacher conflicted,

and that technologies such as e-mail pushed this conflict to new levels. Patricia's sentiments about technology and teaching could be summed up with this quotation:

> I feel like my bread and butter are the things that I bring as a person who interacts with students and with confidence in the classroom. And I don't find myself with the time to do things that might not pan out and that I don't think are central.

When Patricia and I completed the member checking process, she sent this in an e-mail to further clarify her experience using a story from her time as a graduate student:

> In grad school, I had a professor who was (and is) a highly productive and respected scholar – just a really elegant researcher whom I admire a lot. I was her TA at one point, for a large undergrad class. I remember riding in the elevator with her and her saying something like, "Ugh, I have to spend all this time on this (undergrad) teaching and what I really want to be doing is my work (writing)." At the time, I felt kind of sad and crestfallen, like wow, it's a shame that she gives so little value to teaching – I mean, it has to be done here, and it's important, not just a drudgery to get through. Now – having been exposed to the same professional pressures – I certainly understand what was motivating her. My grad school disappointment seems naïve in a way. And yet, I've never really felt like I was in her place; I don't have that same feeling of "I don't want to be here, I'd rather be researching." I didn't really plan on becoming a teacher per se, but it's been sort of a process of discovering something that really does work for me. For me, it's more about trying to balance the different

parts of the job, and feeling like they are unevenly rewarded in the structure of things in the university. One of the things I've always most valued about my department is that both teaching and research are valued pretty equally (more so than in the university as a whole).

Table 5. Patricia's Codes

Waste of time	Technology is not important, cannot justify the time needed
Mother	Important role, often conflicts with being a professor
Prestige	Publications carry more prestige and recognition
Facebook	Evolving attitude, pressure to be there
Researcher	Preferred way of seeing herself, more important for career aspirations
PowerPoint	Best for visual stuff, not important but dominant
Consumerism	Part of technology, not a good lifestyle choice
Publish	Importance is high, wants more time to write, sabbatical
Writing	Importance of words, importance of writing
Technology-centric	University seems to be more…why is this so important?
E-mail	Essential tool for teaching, communicating and research – but also a time waster
Socratic	Preferred way of teaching

Chapter Six

Matt

> Among the things that I really care about and I spend a lot of time doing are my activities as a professor.
>
> Matt

> Taking stock, we can say that we possess a vast accumulation of new knowledge, splendid scientific techniques to increase it further, and immense experience in its application. All this is truth of a kind. This truthful knowledge, as such, does not commit us to a technology of giantism, supersonic speed, violence, and the destruction of human work-enjoyment. The use we have made of our knowledge is only one of its possible uses and, as is now becoming ever more apparent, often an unwise and destructive use.
>
> (Schumacher, 1975, p. 143)

Introducing Matt

When Matt started thinking about technology, he explained that he hadn't really thought about technology as a huge force in determining his professional or personal experience in the academy. For the most part, he knew it was there and appreciated what it did for him, but it really wasn't a significant part of his life. He does, however, note certain exceptions:

> I appreciate that it is easy to get good healthcare, or that I can take my kids to a good dentist, or that I can talk to pretty much anyone in the world, so

> yeah, it's huge, but just not in the way that it has changed who I am as a teacher. I've been using technology since I started teaching, so it's there, but I tend to use it the same ways, ten years ago, and even today.

This quote was from our first interview, and while Matt acknowledged the importance (and benefits) of technology, he did not seem to think it had shaped him very much over the past ten years. Throughout the interview process, he started to see his experience with technology as more complicated than he originally imagined. His analysis of his experience revealed that technology might be shaping him more than be realized. In fact, Matt embodied the double-edged sword of technology in that he benefited and suffered as a result of it. For the purposes of this study, Matt pointed me towards questions about how technology might enhance or deter reflective practice, in teaching and in life. At the core of Matt's experience with technology was the underlying question of whether a technology can enhance or distract, or if it did a little of both.

Of all the participants in this study, Matt was perhaps the most consistently upbeat about tenure. He was happy that the process was over, but didn't feel a need to include the tenure process in very many of his responses in our conversations. Whereas tenure made frequent appearances in conversations with other participants, it was merely a passing thought for Matt. Matt never suggested that he was striving to become a Full Professor.

Matt was pragmatic about tenure; while was something that took off certain pressures, there were plenty of other pressures facing a professor that tenure could not eliminate. Of my participants, Matt spoke about tenure the least. He generally did not incorporate tenure into his answers, nor did he refer to the process of getting tenure as

something that had necessarily shaped how he approached his work or technology in general. His station as an Associate Professor was a good thing for him. Matt seemed aware of the traps that the complacency of tenure might bring, but he had settled comfortably into his being. Tenure was one thing that allowed this settling to happen, but it was an event that had passed.

Matt's Technology and Teaching Experience

Matt had never made technology the center of his teaching practice; however, he was a frequent user of technology and usually saw technology as a good thing in his lifeworld. He also acknowledged that the academy was changing how it made use of technology and what was an acceptable technology practice. For Matt, blogs in particular had become an essential part of his idea development. Matt found blogs to be an open and inviting space where important, vital conversations were happening in his field. While he felt that the academy still put more emphasis on books and articles published in peer-reviewed journals, he was seeing more and more open-access journals. Matt saw his peers' work in some of these open-access journals and understood this evolution as a good thing. He felt that things would continue to move in this direction and that many journals would become online only in the near future. As far as blogs went, he wasn't sure what official role they would play for academics (as far as getting tenure, or getting recognition), but felt they would, too, grow in importance. In Matt's work and thinking, blogs already played a crucial role in furthering his ideas. He toyed with the idea of having his own blog, but hadn't done so just yet. Maintaining a blog would require more time than he was willing to devote.

Matt used online discussion boards in his class and had been using them before he came to the university. Discussion was an important part of his teaching practice, and the online discussion boards enabled him to extend class discussions beyond the traditional classroom. While he saw a benefit in using the discussion board, he was cautious about how much time he spent reviewing what was written there. In his own words:

> I look them (discussion boards) over before I come to class and then bring things up that were said in the discussion so that we can talk more about it in class. But I am careful because, because there are issues of authority. I mean, they are discussing something, and so I only speak up, if, I only speak up if I need to correct something. So, I don't want my perceived authority to shut down the conversation and that can be tricky to manage, but I think I've gotten better at it.

Matt's sensitivity to issues of authority was a large part of his being as a teacher, father, and husband. The anti-authority persona that he put forward in his life, both professionally and personally was important to him. Matt said,

> The way I dress and the way I talk – it works for me. My demeanor in the classroom…I don't know to what extent technology influences that or not, but maybe I am more informal than some professors, and maybe that is because of just, because of who I am, or who I want to be.

Given Matt's holistic approach to putting forth a consistent persona in his life and teaching, it made sense that he would reach for technologies that allowed him to express his individuality. Blogs seemed a logical choice for Matt. On the other hand, a blog was

open to the public and it might have been too public for Matt to use. Matt was a somewhat introverted person who needed peace and quiet to work out his ideas. A blog might bring too much virtual noise to his work. So, while Matt might use technology to do his writing, the writing itself was more likely to take place in a more protected space. On the other hand, blogs are informal, which might appeal to Matt. This was another example of how most technologies have the potential of bringing both good and bad qualities to the professional lives of teachers. Blogs could also represent an important part of Matt's reflective practice, but the reflective experience of blogging was likely to happen only if Matt decided to start his own blog. Given that Matt might be considered an auto-reflective person (meaning someone who is often reflecting on what he is experiencing in real time), his blog reading contributed to his reflective practice.

Matt saw the explosion of social media around him, and it was a force that he could not ignore. He had family members that used it, his students were using it, and his colleagues at the university (and in his field around the world) were using it. While he sometimes wondered whether he was missing out by not participating in the social media culture, his guiding internal voice resisted creating a Facebook account. He said:

> I sometimes feel I need to be doing Twitter or I need to be doing Facebook because there are certain things happening there. My wife is on Facebook, even though she doesn't spend very much time on there and it would be cool to see what Carl is up to or Sam is up to, but I just see Facebook as a black hole waste of time. I know my students are out there, and it might be interesting or fun, but I am not doing it yet.

Matt was protective of his time, particularly time to just reflect and think about what he was doing, and how he was living. Matt was committed to his family, wanting to make sure there was adequate time for his wife and children. He made conscious choices about what he should be doing. Ever mindful of the potential for things on the Internet to waste this time, he was comfortable saying no to things, including to his own temptations. He believed that having tenure also gave him the ability to say no. For example, if the chair of his department came to him with a request to use a particular technology, Matt would have been comfortable saying no. Without tenure, it was unlikely Matt would be so protective of his time and might have to answer affirmatively to work he would prefer to not do. Matt relayed a story about his first full-time job before coming to the academy that also illustrated the importance of controlling his time:

> I spent a year between graduate school and my first tenure track job working in private industry, just because it was in [large western city] and I didn't have to move away. And it (the company) was pretty toxic. I mean it was interesting work in some ways, but there was – my boss was a head case and he would do things like in the middle of testing time because we had a government contract, calling me at like 2:00 in the morning because something wasn't working. Can you come now? It was just, yeah, and so I was like okay I have this job now but I'm – whether or not I get a tenure track job I'm leaving this at the end of the year.

There was a sense of pride in Matt's voice when he talked about his time in private industry – a sense that he proved he could do that kind of work; however, he recognized based on his experience with this particular company that a corporate environment was

not right for him. Matt suggested that at the time, he wasn't sure whether he would land a tenure track position, but recognized it as a better professional path. It was hard for Matt to say whether he had gained any time leaving the corporate environment for an academic position. Indeed, when member checking with Matt, he confirmed that he did not gain any additional time by working in the academy. Matt did admit that the flexibility in his work schedule was a wonderful perk of being a professor. He referenced this perk many times in our conversations, especially when he talked about his responsibilities as a father. He even gave technology some credit for enabling the flexibility of his work hours. Of course, this flexibility brought some additional problems, as Matt said:

> I'm trying to be present for my children and be kind of a contributing member of the household in that way, right, to be there, to be doing – shouldering my part of the burden while at the same time juggling the responsibilities of my job, so there's some conflict there.

Matt was happy to devote time to projects that he deemed worthwhile. If the project was something for which he had a passion (such as something he was interested in researching or writing about) then he was less protective of his time, and might even give of it freely. While Matt was mindful of where his time was going, he was quick to avoid some technologies in which he might otherwise have an interest. In his evaluation of technologies, he usually considered the time costs associated with them.

Matt was aware of the small push from his department to be more publicly visible, but the suggestion was usually benign. Matt described it this way:

> We would like to be recognized in the ecosystem of our field, and some faculty are more active when it comes to posting to blogs or even running

> a blog of their own…doing things like that to have a more public presence on the web. So there is some mild pressure to do that. We want students to come here and to know who we are. So doing your part to participate in blogs in our field, well, pressure might sound too sinister, but yeah, they really want us to do that.

Having tenure allowed Matt to say no to many things, including what may or may not be done in the open space of the Internet. Matt was comfortable saying no, and while he did pursue items of interest on the Internet, what he pursued was not necessarily driven by the interests of his department.

Matt was happy that technology made it easier to work at home. He was also happy with how he used technology in his teaching practice. In fact, there were several times in our conversation that Matt assured me that, despite his resistance to some technologies, he was pleased overall with how technology helped him be a better teacher:

> Despite the disparaging things I've said about Facebook and Twitter and wasting time on the Internet – which are definitely downsides – generally speaking, I'm pretty happy with the way technology is working into teaching.

Matt was happy with his technology use and teaching; however, when I asked him whether or not he would be open to teaching a fully online class, he was resistant. At first, his response revolved around already having too many things to do, and he suggested that setting up an online class would take too much time. As he talked, his response softened, and eventually he settled into the idea of online teaching as a

possibility for some. Later, he listed some concerns about the technologies available to duplicate the rich conversations that happen in his classroom. In his words:

> I'm not against online education as such. I think it depends on the kind of class. Most of the classes I teach, I think it's important to have a lot of discussion. Maybe you can try to replicate that by having everyone Skyping in or having chat rooms, but I don't know how adequate those are. I've never tried those. My guess is that it would be hard to do well.

Matt felt that he put a lot less time into his teaching now, not because he wasn't dedicated to it, but because he had been doing it long enough for it to come more naturally to him. In addition, he was comfortable with what works in his classroom. Matt said,

> When I started out, it took a lot of time to think about what I was doing, to put my classes together. But teaching the sorts of classes I'm teaching, I have some experience with it now. I can do it pretty well, but also I can do it without having to put a gigantic amount of time into it. If I'm doing an entirely new kind of content delivery system, then the learning curve is going to be a lot steeper. I think it'd be very difficult just to figure out how to do it. Course design would be a lot more difficult, and figuring out the interfaces and accessing student projects and all those things that go along with it.

Matt never mentioned the idea or practice of working with an instructional designer or instructional technologist to help him improve, alter, or enhance any of his teaching practices or teaching materials. Matt's perspective was that any work related to his

classes (design, setting up a technology for his class, etc.) was a burden that would rest on his shoulders alone. He might pass some duties like grading papers to a GRA, but he felt strongly that a course he teaches should be his own.

Matt saw the double-edge sword of technology in society. For example, he talked about the great gains in medical care, but acknowledged that as a society we suffered from unnecessary end of life care. Matt was especially concerned with the role that technology played in developing and promoting consumer culture. In his own words:

> Various forms of consumer culture I think overall don't make people happier. Particular cars might be useful to people, but pursuing some fancy thing - I think actually makes life worse overall. I think that wanting to have luxury goods as positional goods, where you want to have not just more, but more than other people – I think that's a ubiquitous phenomenon that recent technology has allowed to spread. It's contributed certainly. This makes things worse for everyone.

Matt articulated a vision of technology as a force for good or bad depending on how it was used. If you met Matt on the street, you might think that he worked in a labor-intensive job. His anti-consumerist sentiment came through in his work and his life. It was not a militant posturing, but was instead the presentation of a concerned person who wanted people to live happy, healthy lives. This sentiment came through in his teaching. Matt did not require his students to purchase technology solely for use in his class. He was not concerned with having the latest gadget, and did not care about the judgments people made about him based on what he drove, wore, or used to send e-mail. Matt was

aware of how technology could make some wants become needs, and did not want to contribute to unnecessary consumption.

Matt revealed that he did not own a smartphone and was not interested in having one. Matt felt that smartphones served as another distraction from being in the present, whether that meant being with his students, spouse, or children. Matt continued to use an analog answering machine at home to screen his calls. He did not see a need to spend money or time purchasing, learning and installing new technology. Matt was measuring things in financial cost (i.e., dollars) as well as time cost (minutes, hours, days). For Matt, time was a precious commodity that he had too little of. While the issue of time came up with every participant, there was a very deep awareness of time costs with Matt. He was protective of his lifeworld and the time spent in it. When he spent time teaching, he wanted to focus on the teaching – not on the technology. When he wanted to spend time with his children, he wanted to minimize distractions. Matt's experience with technology was shaped by his evaluating the associated time costs and guided by the internal question, "How much time will this take?"

Matt also resisted using certain technologies in the classroom. He expressed his concerns about PowerPoint, particularly what he referred to as 'clunkiness':

> It does seem how people use the technology that PowerPoint shifts things more toward "My lecture will now be organized around doing the PowerPoint." And people will be looking up at the PowerPoint and expecting to access the PowerPoint. The PowerPoint is what it's about. You're trying to fit everything into PowerPoint. I don't think that's

> conducive to having people paying attention to what I'm saying, as opposed to looking at the screen all the time.

Matt seemed to be saying that he never wanted his class to be about any particular technology. He wanted his class to be about the topic they were studying. For Matt, PowerPoint was a tool of standardization that distracted students from the intent of the professor. Matt's experience with PowerPoint was an example of the medium becoming the message. Matt recognized that technology (in this case, PowerPoint) could be a distraction to himself and to his students. He seemed to parse and categorize technologies as useful or not, and part of being useful was whether or not the technology was a good fit with his teaching style. This parsing, sorting, and categorizing of technologies defined much of Matt's experience with technology, not only as a professor but also as a father and husband. He was receptive but cautious. For Matt, PowerPoint was restrictive. It limited him, and prevented him from being the teacher that he wanted to be. In addition, Matt would never want a technology to become the meaning of his class. By preventing the technology from entering the learning space, Matt retained control over this classroom.

Matt felt that e-mail and word processors had empowered him to give much more detailed feedback on his students' writing assignments; however, the ease of providing feedback electronically robbed him of the more intimate conversations that might otherwise have happened if students came by during his office hours. In his words:

> I wish students would come to me more to get feedback on their work. I know it's true before e-mail became so prevalent. It's true now. I enjoy – especially with the more bright and eager students – I enjoy talking to

> them about their ideas. I'm happy to have them come to my office hours, and also having them send me drafts via e-mail as an attachment. That's easier for me. This is not a fundamental difference, but it's a difference. I can pull up something as an electronic text and type in my comments and just send it back to them. I'm actually a lot fuller in giving them comments just because my handwriting is really horrible and slow.

Matt was practical in that he recognized the immense productivity gain that electronic texts brought him; however, he noted the lack of student interaction during his office hours. While he didn't fully attribute e-mail and electronic texts for his infrequent face-to-face interactions with students, he thought they contributed to the infrequency. Matt did not want to give up electronic texts, because he believed they allowed him to give more thorough feedback; however, Matt would have preferred more personal interaction with students.

Matt also said this about technology:

> I think there's more to do because of technology – it means that you are constantly on. On the one hand, it means you have more to do because you're constantly on, and it's easier to exchange information. But because it's easier to exchange information it might make some tasks easier to do. It makes it easier to spend more time. I'm pretty aware of the time I'm spending, but I'm still spending more time.

Because Matt had such a deep awareness of his time, and how his time was spent, he recognized this experience for what it was. It was somewhat disorienting and puzzling.

Technology was here to help us, to improve our lives, and to make things more efficient – yet, it seemed to add at least as much work as it seemed to take away.

For Matt, the availability and accessibility of information via the Internet had proven to be enriching in many ways. For example, Matt said,

> It's just vastly easier to get information about what's going on in various PhD programs, what the faulty interests are, to call up articles by people who teach at places, to read up on advice about what you should do or what you shouldn't do to apply to places, even as simple as having online applications as opposed to having paper applications. So the ease of getting information about programs is a radical difference from when I was applying to PhD programs – that has changed, I think, completely.

Though Matt said that open discussion forums on the web can sometimes feature rather distasteful comments, he generally saw the proliferation of information as a good thing -- and not only for him personally, but also for his students. Matt even used this information to monitor what people were saying about the university. He believed this could provide useful insight for the decisions that the university must make about various programs.

Matt thought of himself as a teacher. He felt that it was something he spent the most time doing (whether preparing for a class or teaching it). He was comfortable with his role as a teacher and was happy to tell people that he taught for a living. Matt encountered a variety of responses when he revealed what he taught, but overall, he felt that people could relate to his role as a teacher, even at the college level. For Matt, teaching seemed to be the most important professional component of his professional

lifeworld. That is not to say that writing and service were unimportant, but teaching was at the center of who he was as an academic.

Matt felt that he did not necessarily start off as a great teacher, but he had to practice and get comfortable in his teacher skin. Matt said,

> When I first started teaching it wasn't that I was a terrible teacher. I think I was always an okay teacher but because I was less familiar with the material I was less sure of myself. I would have like very long, detailed notes and I would sort of stick to the notes, and I would talk about these without a break. But as I became more comfortable I think I've become pretty good at just talking through things in a way that's accessible but also I hope pretty engaging.

Matt had grown into good teaching. His teaching practice started off from a place that was not terrible, but it improved as he became more self-aware and familiar with his material. In this way, his teacher experience had contributed to his personal growth as well. He saw the positive impact in his work, and much of that positive impact stemmed from good teaching and mentoring. Matt said,

> There have been a couple of grad students that were under my supervision where I directed their MA thesis and they have taken a couple of classes with me, and then they wrote their thesis with me and then went onto Ph.D programs. And I think I did a really – in some of those cases, I think I did a nice job of giving them feedback, giving them clear directions, helping them with their writing and preparing them well to do further work.

Teaching and online teaching did not carry equal weight, even if the online class was done very well. Matt was concerned about the amount of time it would take to do an online class well. If his department wanted to do an online class, he wanted it to be well done. Because Matt took pride in his work and his department, it was important to him that the quality of what was offered remained high.

Matt got pleasure from certain kinds of service work, such as his role as Director of Graduate Studies for his department. This was a role in which he used technology frequently, but it was the idea that he was making a difference in the lives of graduate students that brought him the most pleasure. Matt said it this way:

> As far as administrative stuff goes, I actually do enjoy being director of graduate studies because it's something where I can actually see that I'm having an impact and making a difference. So it's not just me wasting my time. It actually makes a difference as far as having a well-run program, making sure people get good stipends, making sure people do well applying onto PhD programs.

Matt sometimes enjoyed the ways he could manipulate data in spreadsheets. For example, looking at incoming student data and statistics gave him a degree of insight that he enjoyed sharing with his department. Matt recognized the danger of being overly consumed by such work, though. He knew that the tools he used to collect and organize this data had become very sophisticated, and while it was possible to do more with the data, he wondered whether it would have been time well spent. He wondered how much more value could be gained from manipulating the data, and admitted that he was

sometimes caught up in what was possible before realizing that just because it was possible didn't mean that it was worthwhile.

Matt spent a fair amount of time on various committees, but would have been happy to do away with that kind of work altogether. For Matt, committee work was almost always time consuming and seemed to contribute very little to the overall good of the university.

When I asked Matt whether he ever concerned himself with whether a technology might one day replace the traditional role of teacher, he was not moved:

> I'm not convinced that it will. It could, but I know that some people have talked about the possibility that you can use computers and technology just to deliver educational content online, and that means you won't have to have teachers doing it. Maybe, maybe not. I don't think if that is going to happen, I don't think it's happened yet. Either way, I don't have to worry as much.

Matt was not threatened by technology and saw his work as teacher as an essential ingredient in the learning experience of his students. He saw his experience as a teacher as important, not only to his personal and professional life, but also to the overall life and health of a university.

Matt looked at his lifeworld, personally and professionally, through a holistic lens. Though boundaries existed, he tried to be the same person in all his lifeworlds. His view of life, and how one might live life, influenced his choices as an academic, husband, and father. He did not filter out his beliefs for one role or another, but combined his attitude and outlook into the whole of his lifeworld. This was not to say that conflicts did not

occur, but that Matt looked at things in a way that was inclusive of all areas of his life. He saw the pieces of his life as connected, creating the whole of his experience.

Matt's biggest challenge was maintaining healthy boundaries between his work life and personal life. Matt was raising three children with his wife and frequently felt guilt about doing something online (such as responding to an e-mail) when his children would rather he played a game. In his own words:

> Oh, actually Art wants to play a game with me basically and he comes up to the computer and I'm saying "No I can't right now. Let me finish this." You know, I don't want to be blowing him off constantly, of course, because it's nice that your children want to play with you.

Matt made note of the ever expanding complexity and capabilities of various technologies, such as Excel. He derived some pleasure from organizing information in a spreadsheet, and he enjoyed looking at the data, particularly on incoming students; however, he recognized that the complexity and richness of a data set can become a distraction. Matt described it this way:

> It makes it easier to spend more time. I'm pretty aware of the time I'm spending, but I'm still spending more time. It's just easier to spend the time. I'm supposedly a professor and not an accountant, but I can spend a lot of time – which I couldn't spend before – looking over spreadsheets and budget numbers for our graduate program, and messing around with them, which is something I didn't do before.

Matt was often surprised to discover that he found some degree of satisfaction in keeping graduate spreadsheets for the department. He believed he was good at doing this work, but questioned which parts of the process were truly useful and which parts serve as a distraction from more important things. Matt was vigilant with regards to the ever-expanding functionality of the technological tools that he used. He was somewhat fascinated but also cautious, ever mindful that his time could be slipping away into some meaningless activity.

From a professional standpoint, Matt saw himself as a teacher. He believed that the majority of his work revolved around teaching, and also felt that the scholarly work he did contributed to his teaching. Matt's father worked in insurance, and seeing his father work in a job that was often less than satisfying helped formulate Matt's decision to pursue his own interests. In his own words:

> I just wanted to study things because I thought they were really interesting. And in part that was driven by seeing that my Dad was in the insurance business and he had a rough time of it in some ways for various reasons. So I'm like going to spend most of – you know, half my waking life at my job, which I will. I want to make sure that I can do something I enjoy. And I was fortunate to be in a position where I had that luxury. So I was fortunate to be in a privileged position where I could have the luxury of studying something just because I found it intrinsically valuable.

Early on, Matt decided to take the unconventional path of following his bliss, and it turned out well for him. This decision to pursue his interests pointed towards Matt's early reflective practice of analyzing the experience of others (in this case, his father). Early in

life, Matt had a preference for the life of the mind, and that was one important force that led him to teaching. Matt's reflective practice served him well, giving him a life that he embraced and enjoyed.

Matt saw his core work as a teacher as ultimately unchanged. In his words:

> The texts we discuss, the interaction of the classroom, the papers I get – those are going to form most of the basis for how I track the students, how I access their thinking too. I don't think those are fundamentally different than they were 15 years ago even when I was a teaching assistant grading blue books…so basically, I don't think it (technology) has changed things in any fundamental way.

This suggested that the kind of teaching-related activities that Matt did when he first started teaching were fundamentally the same at the time of our interviews. There was still classroom discussion, though it may have occurred online. There were still texts to read, though those texts might have been read with an online reader. The core activities remained the same. Matt quickly followed up the above quotation with, "It certainly is very different." Matt's comment was not a contradiction, but instead points us towards what had and had not changed in teaching. For Matt, the standard practice of what he did remained the same, but the way in which those core activities were conducted at the time of the interview was different from what had been done fifteen years ago.

When Matt talked about doing his work, he recognized that he was, more often than not, connected. As he put it:

> I almost always have a browser open. My e-mail is one of the windows. You're constantly doing that no matter pretty much what time of day it is.

> That's a little bit different. I don't know if it changes the meaning of things fundamentally, but that's a significant change.

Matt used the word 'significant' to point towards a technology that has perhaps altered his life in more ways than he could have imagined. Matt knew that he would probably have a window dedicated to e-mail up if he was using his computer. Though he did not own a smartphone, he checked his e-mail often. By taking the time to check his e-mail, he was likely to respond relatively quickly to the e-mails as they arrived. This created an ongoing work cycle for him, but it is one that he ultimately picked for himself. In other words, there was no one saying to Matt that he must have a window open for e-mail. Still, he chose to do so.

Matt was somewhat skeptical of major fundamental changes to teaching as a practice because of technology, at least in part because of his strength as a teacher without technology. Matt said:

> I've really led some classes where there were good conversations, fruitful conversations, where people really felt engaged and they felt they developed their skills and they developed their own thinking in doing that, and got excited about the ideas. I think I'm pretty proud of that.

Matt went on to say that he did not worry as much because the kinds of students who were drawn to his field were perhaps less enamored by technology, and, perhaps more importantly, he was tenured. Matt had seen educational fads come and go, especially educational technology fads. He believed that there was value in what he brought to the academy, and that it could not be replaced by technology.

For Matt, technology had made some things easier. E-mail was clearly something that had made many things easier for Matt. For example:

> It's easier to get their stuff to take with me to comment on it and get it back to them. So I'm very happy when students send me drafts. I think that the technology makes that easier. Usually I am willing to work out things via e-mail. This is true with my colleagues too.

Matt gave e-mail credit as a tool that improved his ability to comment on student work, and to get it back to them quickly. Matt liked to see a draft of an essay before the final version was submitted, and e-mail facilitated that. Matt also saw e-mail as an important part of his communication with colleagues.

Matt's vision of being a member of the academy involved a holistic approach to living and working. In other words, Matt hesitated to distinguish between being a scholar, being a teacher, and living his life. The two were closely connected in his life, in his being, and in his experience. Matt was not merely a teacher, but someone who demonstrated his philosophy of life in all aspects of how he lived.

Matt was aware that his idealism was largely responsible for getting him into this line of work. But while idealism had carried him into the field of academics, he also acknowledged the important role of being an administrator in his success. Matt said:

> It turns out I'm actually as much – almost as much at least – an administrator as I am an academic. So that's been a big shift. And I don't know whether that's a loss of idealism or just – I mean I'm – and if I knew that the – if I had known that the academic job market is as bad then as I know it is now I might of even had a little more trepidation about it. But I

> was very much like, oh, it'll work out. I'll go to graduate school and after I go to graduate school I'll become a professor, and actually that worked out for me.

Matt looked back at his idealism as an important part of his getting into the academy. While he looked upon it with some amusement, he attributed part of this idealism to arrogance and ignorance, suggesting that idealism might not appear without these characteristics. It was the blending of these elements that got him where he was today.

Matt believed that the academic job market was unlikely to improve and worried that there were too many programs creating too many PhDs. Matt said:

> The academic market in (my field) and also the sort of ecosystem of some graduate programs, let's put it that way, is that there's a real glut of PhD programs, and a lot of the PhD programs have difficulty placing their graduates in any kind of long term employment, and so I think the world would be better if a lot of the PhD programs currently in existence would disappear.

Matt blended his idealism with the reality of the world in which he found himself. Matt offered direct feedback to his students about the difficulty of finding a job in the academy but tempered it with encouragement and guidance. While it might seem harsh for Matt to want several PhD programs in his field to cease to exist, he genuinely believed it would benefit his overall field.

Summary

Matt could not be easily stereotyped. If one judged him based on his appearance he/she would probably think that he worked on a construction crew. Within seconds of speaking with him, it became evident that he was a gentle soul with an analytical mind. Matt used technology every day in his teaching and in his life in general; however, technology was not something that he considered to be fundamental to his teaching or his academic experience. Matt summed up his view of his experience in the academy towards the end of our last interview quite well:

> Among the things that I really care about and I spend a lot of time doing are my activities as a professor. So, I certainly don't think that my value as a human being is determined by professional success or anything like that. I mean if I were to lose my job somehow and do something else I don't think like that would be the end of my life or the death of me as a human being. That's not part of my personality in that kind of way. But yeah, it's an important part of what I do from day-to-day. It's an important part of what I care about. It's consumed a lot of my life, not just in terms of like getting training in order to get a job to do something, but actually dedicating myself to studying it and learning it. And then on the teaching side, trying to get better at it, so yeah, I would say it's a big part of my identity as a person.

Matt did not see the technological part of his teaching as something that required a great deal of thought or consideration. It was there, he acknowledged it and used it, but it did not dominate his approach. In fact, technology did not play a role in how he planned to

teach. It was not a conscious decision to exclude it, but rather a conscious focus on what was important to Matt. This meant focusing on teaching his subject matter to the best of his ability.

Table 6. Matt's Codes

Waste of time	Easy to get lost in, time disappears, time evaporates
Blogs	Source of amusement, source of information, source of reflection, important discussions
Online journals	Growing in importance
Committee	Committee work takes too much time, wish it would disappear
Excel	Time consuming but fun, interesting to organize and analyze data
PowerPoint	Restrictive, in the way, controlling
Consumerism	Driven by technology, causes too much useless competition
DGS	Director of Graduate Studies, interesting role, good way to learn
Socratic	Preferred style of teaching, can't really be done online
MOOCs	Will not replace professors, just one experience
Environmental	Important to consider for technology choices
Cost	Important to consider for students, institution, faculty

Chapter Seven

Sandra

> I can't ignore technology because my students are into it, and if I ignore it, then I'll lose some of them simply because there's no existence there.
>
> Sandra
>
> In the last twenty years the amount of time Americans have spent at their jobs has risen steadily. Each year the change is small, amounting to about nine hours, or slightly more than one additional day of work.
>
> (Schor, 1991, p. 1)

Introducing Sandra

Sandra's data was rich and messy as she sometimes seemed to diverge from the focus of the question with personal stories from her professional and personal life. These excursions off the beaten path were not fanciful tales but powerful descriptions of Sandra's life experience as an academic. In my initial readings of the data, I did not immediately notice that Sandra's stories and observations were giving me useful insight into my questions. This was one reason why so many phenomenologists state that repeated readings are essential in phenomenological research (Van Manen, 1990).

Sandra had an epiphany while she was an undergraduate at a medium-sized teaching university in the midwestern United States. She was taking a class in a subject that would become a central part of what she taught and researched at the time of these interviews when she realized that she wanted to teach that very topic at the college level. She told her boyfriend at the time and was met with skepticism. He didn't believe that she could possibly know what she wanted to do with the rest of her life, especially that early in life.

And how could she pick something so specific, something that would sustain her throughout an entire career? Sandra did not flinch. She called her father to share the news. When she conveyed that she wanted to go to graduate school and ultimately become a teacher at a college, he paused and then responded, "Well, that's a noble profession." When Sandra conveyed to me the experience of telling her father, it was clear that she believed he was somewhat disappointed at her decision, but that he felt relief when he learned that she would have an assistantship and he would not have to pay for her graduate education.

Sandra came from a family of teachers, and she believed that teaching was "in her blood." From the moment she knew she wanted to be a teacher, she worked towards that goal, and since she started teaching, she hadn't stopped. Over time, her attitude towards teaching and what it meant to work as a tenured professor changed. While she loved the teaching portion of her job, she was sometimes at odds with it. Sandra developed a very personal style of teaching in which she felt connected to the students. She wanted them to do well and succeed and seemed to genuinely care about their long term success. There was a strong mothering component to her teaching, and even though she might hesitate to call it that, she acknowledged it.

Sandra was very clear that teaching was the part of her professional experience that she most valued. It was something that had been important for her entire professional career and was not something that she wanted to let go, even if she won the lottery. In fact, she suggested that if she won the lottery, she would hire someone to do the things that she didn't want to do but would continue teaching. Sandra had a very outgoing personality but was also reflective, always considering what was and was not working in

her teaching. During our interviews and conversations, it was clear that she spent time examining and making sense of her life, professionally and personally. While some of my questions would occasionally surprise her, she was often able to quickly relate the question to something that she had thought about before.

Sandra had always done exceptionally well in school, and she attributed much of this success to her work ethic and organizational abilities. As a student, she embraced assignments with vigor. While she admitted to being a 'people pleaser' she also had a drive to succeed – a kind of internal yardstick against which she consistently measured herself. She enjoyed doing a concrete task with a specific objective and outcome. She talked quite a bit about how doing the picture assignment was fun for her. In all our talks she spoke of the pleasure she received from doing work that ended with a definitive, physical outcome – a completed project that could be pointed to as a symbol of successful work. At times, she almost seemed to speak of this pride in organizational work as something about which she was slightly embarrassed. For Sandra, it almost seemed as though a tenured professor should only work within the clouds of theory rather than doing something that was considered lesser work, no matter how happy this organizational work made her. Regardless of how Sandra felt others perceived the pride she took in her work, it was an essential part of her being.

The cloud of doing research and getting it published was at the center of a professional conflict that Sandra was experiencing, and had been experiencing for some time. Ten years ago, Sandra did not have tenure, but her outstanding teaching and service record, combined with several publications in high-quality journals enabled her to cross the

finish line. Sandra told me that the pressure to publish was still with her, and was probably growing even though she was tenured.

She connected deeply with her students. In her own words:

> I think because of the nature of what I teach, I probably get more self-disclosure about particular experiences they're having in their lives than maybe some other faculty. And that always turns into a good thing. It's always a productive thing, even if it's a situation where I have to send them to counseling or something, or recommend that.

Perhaps because Sandra was so willing to open her life to people (researchers like myself, but also students) she got much from her students in return. Sandra felt this openness in teaching brought many rewards.

Sandra's experience with tenure had been mostly positive. She remembered the good feelings she had when she completed the process and pointed towards several large binders on a bookcase containing her tenure materials. As an Associate Professor, she liked knowing that her position was secure; however, Sandra felt as though she was falling behind in reaching the promotion to Full Professor. For Sandra, tenure was an important achievement, but it was also a platform from which to move to the next level. Sandra was always a good student, and success in school came easily for her. She suggested that she may even be smarter than she thinks and that she probably did not give herself enough credit, not only for what she had achieved but for what she had the potential to achieve. This was not said in a boasting manner, but in a humble way that suggested she may sometimes struggle with issues of worthiness.

Sandra talked about the pressure to publish, but it was sometimes hard to distinguish whether pressure came from her department, herself, or her colleagues. For Sandra, the pressure was always there, regardless of from where it first emerged. It darkened the landscape of an otherwise pleasant job.

Sandra's Technology and Teaching Experience

Sandra had been using technology in her classes for a while, but it was only recently that she started being more of an innovator in regards to it. She seemed to be at a place where she wanted to try new things and to give her students new experiences and ways of learning. For most of her professional life, she thought of herself as a PC person and tried to avoid Macs; however, her recent experiences with an iPad have caused her to reconsider what kind of technology to use. In her own words:

> I'm not an Apple person and that's really hard for me, but yeah, it is fantastic, it's phenomenal. It's, it's easy to use and you don't have to wait and wait for it to boot up – it's always on and the battery lasts a long time. Yeah, I probably like it too much.

Sandra had not consciously resisted technology as a whole, but had been very selective about what technologies she would use both personally and professionally. She wanted open systems, and explained that one of the reasons she had resisted Apple products was because they seemed very closed, expensive, and restrictive. She was reluctant to admit that she used an iPad because she did not want to seem like a supporter of Apple, but she was unable to hide her enthusiasm for the iPad, and suggested multiple times in our talks that the device was in fact transforming how she performed her work.

Overall, Sandra saw technology as a positive part of her teaching practice, but she acknowledged that technology had changed her teaching style in ways that were beyond her control. She suggested that until these interviews, she had not realized just how much she may have changed. For example, Sandra had adjusted many things about her teaching practice such as attendance policy, assignment deadlines, and other things. While these changes were not made entirely because of technology, one could not ignore how various technologies had shaped some of her class management decisions. Sandra was not one to fight against technology, but preferred to make a space for it. Even if she decided to not use a particular technology, she was comfortable with her students' using whatever they found useful.

Sandra did not have specific rules about technology in the classroom. In other words, students were allowed to bring technology such as laptops and phones. Sandra said:

> I will publicly shame them in class if they're doing something that's obviously Facebook or technology related and they're giggling and causing a disturbance. Until they cause a disturbance, I don't put a stop to it.

This might be considered Sandra's compromise with how students use technology. She accepted that there would always be elements of technology that she could not control in the classroom, so she made a space for students to use it. She had no qualms about correcting their technology use when things crossed a line. This attitude seemed to point towards her belief that she wanted to meet students halfway. She was willing to give them some freedom and was willing to let them make decisions about how they learned, studied, and participated. Part of this approach was guided by research she read

suggesting that students were going to send text messages in class and there was surprisingly little faculty could do about it. While it might seem that this acceptance of students' sending text message was a minor surrender, for Sandra, it was a matter of practicality and compromise.

Sandra also used technology as a tool to reinvigorate her teaching. She said,

> I got to a place where I just felt like I needed something new in my teaching to help me get excited again. And so the iPad has definitely been a good thing for that.

While there was a large body of evidence suggesting that technology itself did not necessarily lead to better learning outcomes, there was far less information about how technology might be used (by faculty or by instructional technologists) to get faculty excited about teaching. Sandra had been teaching for over sixteen years and she was upfront about her need to bring something new to her practice. She understood that reinvigorating her teaching was not necessarily going to help move her towards being a Full Professor – but that wasn't necessarily her concern when making instructional choices. The use of technology was something she was undertaking for her own personal enrichment as a teacher. She acknowledged that the innovation of using technology would probably be positively received in her annual review, but the changes were mostly driven by self-motivation. The chair of her department mentioned technology programs in departmental meetings, but there was little true encouragement of technology use. For Sandra, technology offered a new way of experiencing her subject and interacting with her students, and that was motivation enough.

Sandra had never taught online, or even a hybrid class, and was reluctant to attempt to turn anything she taught into a fully online experience. Part of this resistance was because of what she taught; however, she admitted to making concessions. In her own words:

> I have tried to increase the online presence of my classes during that time – some of it begrudgingly, sort of accepting that this is the direction we're going in, so either get with it or lose connection to your students, and that is what I'm all about, is connecting to my students and hopefully being able to share with them.

While her initial relationship with the online component of teaching started off in a somewhat forced way, she was starting to see some positive results of having a class presence online. For example, Sandra's LMS use started off as little more than a repository of documents but has transformed over the past several years into something more substantial. Now the LMS was not just a placeholder, but served to further interaction between students, and between Sandra and her students. Sandra suggested that the bad economy also acted as an agent of change in getting her online. Because her department wanted to limit printing and copying costs, faculty members were encouraged to put their syllabi online. Sandra believed that this forced many people, including herself, to learn more about the LMS. She said that just the practice of putting documents into the LMS got her over her fear of using it. For a while, Sandra would still give out a kind of shortened paper version of her syllabi on the first day of class. She only did this for a couple of years, however, and, by the time of these interviews, had fully transitioned to putting all her class documents online. She had wondered if students would complain about not being given a paper copy, but there was never a complaint.

Sandra liked to 'see' what her students did online. She liked knowing that they had to take some initiative to get the syllabus. Even though it was simple for a student to log into the LMS and download the syllabus, this act required effort on the part of the student, whereas Sandra's merely handing out the syllabus in class required nothing of the student. Sandra had originally resisted putting all class documentation online, but, by the time of her interviews, felt she could never go back to handing out paper in class. This pointed towards a change in how she approached her teaching. The change she once resisted was now embraced.

When talking about her professional experience, Sandra made it clear that she preferred teaching to doing research; however, she was quick to point out that when she was doing research, she loved it, too. It seemed that teaching was something she could slip into rather easily whereas research required more thought, deliberation, and focus. On the other hand, letting go of her research also meant relinquishing some level of prestige and recognition. Sandra was a people pleaser, and there were some people who would only be pleased if she were publishing. It was also true that there were parts of Sandra that could only be happy if she were publishing. The problem was in finding the time and motivation to do the meaningful kind of research that she wanted to do. Even Sandra was not entirely sure why the writing and research were so hard to bring forth.

Sandra questioned whether her experience as a researcher had as much impact on her experience as a teacher as she might have initially believed. Teaching was easy and natural; it was something that Sandra could step into with minimal effort. Research, on the other hand, took considerable time to get into. Getting started was difficult for Sandra, and she had started feeling more and more pressure to get things done on the

research side of her profession, which caused her stress. She saw some of the conversations that emerged with her colleagues as very empowering, almost as a kind of nudge to spend more time on research. Sandra felt that her department supported her ideas, and even gave her encouragement, but she wanted the conversations and encouragement to emerge more often. Sandra conveyed some of the complexity:

> Their reactions confirm that I have good ideas and I'm on the right track with something. So that's exciting. But I don't have those conversations very often.

Sandra longed for a more cohesive scholarly community that supported the kind of research she wanted to do. When she talked about her department, she pointed out the differences in how she approached her work and how her colleagues approached theirs. Sandra preferred to come into the office, even if she was coming in to the office to write and had no teaching duties. She said her office door was almost always open, meaning that she was visibly present and available to her department. Because she did not have a dedicated office or writing room in her house, she preferred coming to work. Though her office door was open, few people (colleagues or students) stopped by to see her. She suggested that her department did not necessarily notice or care that she was physically present, even though she felt it was important. At the time of this study, Sandra was compiling data from a student survey. The data suggested that the students would also like a sense of community to be developed within the department. Sandra noted that she was awash in student data, but that it was not data from which she could publish.

Perhaps the biggest conflict that Sandra experienced was that between being a mother and an academic. Her experience with the academy, particularly within her department,

had sometimes clashed with motherhood. Sandra felt that she had been denied some opportunities in her department because of her being a mother. In addition, as she thought through the list of female professors in her department, she noted that none of them had children, and that many of them were single. Sandra did not regret having children or being married, but felt that her decision to have children had definitely held her back professionally. An experience she had with the chair of her department had contributed to her negative experience. Sandra suggested that at the time, she wasn't aware that much of the language used in the conversation was sexist, and that the chair was basically telling her that she could not do certain things because she was a mother. At the time, she thought that perhaps the chair was simply protecting her from doing too much work, but by the time of the interviews, she felt that the chair was actually preventing her from doing certain things because it might have been inconvenient for someone with children to be in charge. While Sandra did not seem bitter, she was clearly disappointed in herself and her department. She admitted to feeling envious of her colleagues. She also felt that because they were single and could work on the weekend, she could never properly compete with them.

The conflict remained fresh in her mind; however, she was happy to be a mother. In fact, being a mother was more important to her than any career choices. In her own words:

> Sometimes I have resentment that being a professor takes away from my ability to be a mom. I don't have resentment that being a mom takes away from being a professor. I just have stress about it, right? It's different. I

> would not give up being a mom. If I had to, I would give up being a professor. But I can't imagine me not teaching.

This pointed to a significant conflict between Sandra's professional and personal identities. Part of this conflict was in wanting a connection with her children, but also wanting a connection with her students via teaching. Sandra could not imagine not having a 'classroom connection' via teaching. Sandra's experience as an educator was an experience of connection. Sandra's quotation at the beginning of the chapter points towards the importance of connection with her students. This need for connection was something that shaped Sandra's decisions in the classroom. She searched for new ways to connect with her students, trying to find them wherever they may be on the virtual plain. This searching out and exploration of student spaces could be jarring – it was not a space that Sandra was accustomed to navigating; however, she took great pleasure in finding successful ways to connect with her students. It was a part of her being, this connection.

Sandra felt that her PhD gave her options. She could imagine teaching elsewhere, especially if the pressure to produce more research continues to mount at her current university. She talked about her frustration with having no pay raise in five years, and the increasing amounts of work she had to do. She said that while she wouldn't want to give up her teaching connection, she wasn't tied to teaching at this particular institution. She said that tenure was supposed to be the point where you settle in and get comfortable, but for her, it was not that clear cut. A move was always possible. An institution that was more focused on teaching seemed to appeal to her. She wondered if an institution that was more focused on teaching might also have a greater sense of community as well.

Whether or not this was a case of 'the grass is greener' or not, Sandra seriously considered other places to teach.

She also seemed to be playing with the idea of changing her professional path. This was not an idea that just appeared during our conversation, but was something that Sandra had been considering for a few years. She indicated that while it was something she toyed with in her mind, it was not the kind of thing that she would usually mention to others. Such a departure seemed unlikely, but playing with the idea was an exercise in which she sometimes indulged. That she considered such a thing certainly tells us that teaching matters to her and that it provided professional motivation.

Sandra used technology to strengthen the teaching connection part of her job. She was now using technology to stay in contact with her students, even on the weekend. She was also putting more and more things into the LMS for her classes. She maintained her office hours even though it was rare that a student came to see her. The students were important to her but being a mother to her children was more important. Sandra felt that her role in academia had been marginalized because she was a mother, and that the two roles were perhaps incompatible.

Sandra was much more likely to talk to someone about her experience as a teacher than as a researcher. She went into her field because she wanted to teach. Research (and even service) was not something she considered as part of her professional package. Over the past ten years as a university professor, she had a much better understanding of what being an academic meant. Some of these identities appealed to her and others seemed to be shrinking in importance.

One important aspect of Sandra's experience was the broad category of service for the university. Sandra enjoyed organizing, sorting, and filing things. Early on in her life, she thought she might want to be a secretary. She derived great pleasure from taking a task and completing it. For Sandra, there was less satisfaction in having something published, and the satisfaction was always delayed, if it arrived at all:

> Usually with the service kinds of work, there's immediate gratification. Maybe that's the big distinction with research. You do the report. You turn it in. You get the e-mail from the chair that says this is fabulous. And I know that the Dean is gonna agree with me. And you print it and put it in your folder for some day whereas the journal article, you submit it. And it may be months before you hear anything. It's never, you're brilliant – done!

The experience of immediate gratification associated with some service work appealed to Sandra. Given Sandra's need for connection and work that provided more immediate feedback, it made sense that she preferred to work on those kinds of projects.

Sandra pointed out that her lack of research in the past two years was a more complicated situation:

> My research productivity has been slacking as of late…If there's a teaching task or a service task, I've been fairly quick to do that in my spare time. Research has always seemed too hard to get into, and I don't think that's been an accurate perception. I just think it's been one of the ways I have avoided doing it perhaps.

This passage suggested that Sandra used an internal voice to guide herself to the things she wanted to do, and away from the things that she didn't want to do. Whether or not the research really did take longer to 'get into,' it seemed that Sandra was less interested in doing research as a part of her professional path.

Sandra talked about the emotional roller coaster of getting feedback on an article from a journal:

> I have to read the comments as soon as I get them because it's like I have to know. Then I have to spend some time being angry at the idiots. And then I have to try to depersonalize it and accept that they may actually have a point or five and then do the work to get it published or whatever. But if you put those three tasks in front of me, I'm gonna pick service and teaching almost every time.

The experience of submitting an article to a journal, and the stress that goes with the process, was another factor that moved Sandra towards a greater focus on teaching and service work.

For many years, Sandra felt torn between her role as a professor and her role as a mother but she was now settling into a comfortable space where she allowed both to flourish. Technology seemed to be assisting her with this transition. She thought this might continue as her children got older.

Sandra was initially surprised about the research component of her career path when she first started graduate school. Research seemed to take her by surprise, even though she came to enjoy it. The library was one of her favorite places on earth; however, she lamented that technology had made it almost unnecessary to go there. Sandra wanted her students to understand what a journal looked like and frequently brought hard copies of

the journal to class to show them. She believed it was important for students to see the physical aspect of a journal as opposed to just thinking of it as an electronic resource.

Sandra was starting to question how to best use electronic communication mediums in her curriculum. She felt a certain responsibility to ensure that her students were thinking about what they do in online environments and digital mediums. Sandra considered her personal life circumstances when she talked about this. For example:

> Many years ago, if I was, say, going to have a big meeting at work, I would expect a call from my husband, to you know, wish me luck, or if it was afterwards, to call me and ask how things went – something like that. Now, I expect a text. And I don't like it if I don't get one (laughing).

This passage revealed that Sandra was working and living in a space that was often mediated by technology, and digital communications were an important part of her lifeworld. She gave more and more feedback to students via technology as well. One might say that the learning lifeworld of her students was frequently mediated by technology. These mediations were not always positive, however. For example, Sandra put a lot of thought into the ways that students used technology excuses to get around doing academic work. She also arranged many classroom activities (such as tests) in ways that might initially be seen as unconventional; however, the changes were a necessary part of using digital tools for certain academic activities. By the time of these interviews, she spent portions of class instructing students on the various ways that a help ticket could be submitted to the IT (Information Technology) department. Part of the reason she did this was to prevent students from saying they couldn't turn in an assignment on time or couldn't take a test within the required time frame. Sandra told me

many stories about how she structured items in the LMS in such a way as to 'outsmart' the students. One simple example was time issues:

> Usually now I give them one day, but I do give them from 12:01 to 11:59 and I even do those times purposely so that they can't give me any crap about midnight and noon and they can't tell the difference…so I had to rephrase my policy so it would be more clear.

Another interesting change that Sandra experienced was the loss of the physical in student assignments, and the sense of urgency that the physical presence of papers could bring. Sandra explained that because she could now review, correct, and grade student papers on her iPad, she was no longer carrying around a stack of papers. Sandra believed that the physical presence of the papers, and perhaps even the inconvenience of having to carry them around, worked as a kind of motivator. The papers were always there, waiting to be picked up and graded. Sandra said that ungraded papers were almost like a voice that spoke to her from across the room that, while annoying, often pushed her to get things done. Since she was having students submit papers electronically by the time of these interviews, and because she did not have to print a paper in order to grade it, the former pressure no longer existed. Sandra said this had been catching up with her this semester because she was behind on grading and some students were becoming frustrated with her as a result. This experience had been especially surprising to Sandra and she was not sure how long it would take for her to adjust. She wondered if the lack of the physical made the assignments seen less real and even less urgent, but felt things had changed too quickly to properly assess whether this would be a long term problem for her teaching practice.

Sandra suggested that the iPad mixed the lifeworlds of school (or work) and entertainment. Because it was so easy to check e-mail with the iPad, and because the iPad could quickly launch a game or other distraction, she wasn't sure whether the teaching tool part was too often confused with the entertainment device part. Of course, a similar argument could be made for many technologies (telephones, television, computers, etc.). The blurring between the line of personal and professional is one that Sandra had traditionally navigated with caution, never even wanting to do work on the weekend. By the time of these interviews, that line was crossed frequently. Again, it was hard to say whether part of this stemmed from the novelty of the iPad. It was new for Sandra, and only time would tell whether Sandra would choose to redraw her dividing lines. Sandra felt good about being able to quickly respond to e-mails for the time being, and because this made her feel more connected to her students, she was likely to continue using the iPad.

Sandra touched on the topic of PowerPoint and how it had changed her teaching practice. Much of this part of our conversation revolved around posting PowerPoint presentations online for student consumption. Sandra said that she made slight alterations to her PowerPoint presentations each year but that the essential information was the same. She saw herself as lazy when it came to updating her teaching materials. She talked about how her colleagues had a strict policy of not letting students get the PowerPoint presentations if they did not come to class, but Sandra made the presentation available and just removed her notes. She told her students that much of the information on the slides would not make sense without the notes, which could be taken down in class. She saw PowerPoint as a useful teaching tool but acknowledged the uncertainty of whether or

not it had improved her teaching practice. In a way, the PowerPoint slides that were posted online served as a motivator to get students to class. As Sandra said to her students:

> You'll have an outline if you look at these PowerPoints, but you're not gonna have any details, so if you can understand what a picture of a diary on that slide means, great; but if not, you'll need to be in class.

This seemed to be a way of using PowerPoint to bring students into the classroom for interaction and deeper learning. Maintaining two versions of the PowerPoint presentation (one with notes and another without notes) added to the work that Sandra had to do for a class; however, if it served the purpose of making a deeper connection with her students and doing a better job of teaching, Sandra was willing to do it.

Sandra had not used technology to take attendance for her classes; in fact, she did not have an attendance policy. This was a common theme for many of the faculty in this study, but Sandra was the only one who felt that this policy might suggest she was lazy. Sandra wanted to eliminate things that did not directly contribute to her connection with students. She wanted students to attend class (and she confirmed that almost all of them do) but she wanted them to come because they enjoyed the experience. Having tenure gave her the flexibility to focus on what she considered to be important, and for Sandra, that was definitely teaching, and not the administrative tasks that were often associated with teaching. Her teaching style had deepened over the years, and her recent incorporation of various technologies (heavier LMS use, the iPad) had reinvigorated her teaching and connection with students. Perhaps the biggest technology-related change for Sandra was discovering new ways of connecting with her students with technology while

not allowing it to intrude into her personal life. At the time of these interviews, she seemed to be managing the change quite well.

Because some technologies did not require long boot times, Sandra was much more likely to do things like check e-mail on the weekend. While she once had a policy of not checking or responding to e-mail on the weekend, she was able to do so frequently because her iPad was always on. Sandra did suggest that weekend e-mails usually required very little writing. In other words, the response she gave was short and simple. She was unsure whether she would eventually feel as though the iPad was interrupting her life at home.

For Sandra, some technologies (in this case, the iPad) were so easy to set up and use, that it is difficult to *not* use them. For example, Sandra said that she would sometimes be watching a television program with her children and 'find' the iPad in her hands. It was brought to her attention when one of her children said, "Mommy, you have to watch this part." Sandra was aware that some technologies could become invasive, and she was concerned about work cutting into time with her family. Up until the past year, she felt as though she could control it, but some protective walls she had once constructed seemed to be coming down. Because most of the e-mail she received from students only required a short response, and because the iPad required no boot time, she didn't feel interrupted. For now, the roles of mother and teacher coexisted with the help of technology.

Summary

Sandra strongly identified as a teacher; however, her overall role as an academic frequently conflicted with her role as a mother. Her role as teacher had been shaped by technology, though it was only recently (in the past one or two years) that technology had

come to play a larger and usually positive role in her teaching. Because Sandra was focused on connecting with her students, she had opened herself up to various technologies that she might have once resisted. Though she could not see herself ever teaching a fully online class, she definitely saw the online component of her class growing for many years to come, assuming she continued to teach. For Sandra, teaching was a core part of her being, but something that she would potentially give up in her current environment. Sandra was also enthusiastic about the rewards and gratification of service work, while her work as a researcher was less important. While Sandra felt a need to rekindle her research agenda, she was finding it difficult. Sandra stood at a crossroads, unsure whether to work within her existing system or to find another institution that would allow her to focus solely on teaching. She was skeptical that such a situation existed, however, and felt conflict between her desire to become a Full Professor and the reality of what it would involve. Sometimes, she lost herself in the teaching and service work so as not to deal with the research that she might otherwise have been doing.

Table 7. Sandra's Codes

Pressure	Always pressure to do more, always pressure to publish
Mother	Hard to juggle responsibilities, would give up the academy for being a mother if she had to
Prestige	Teaching lacks, publishing gets all the attention
Weekends	Once precious and protected, slowly being chipped away
Researcher	Pressure to strive for this, wanting to get things off the ground
PowerPoint	Used often, sets of rules for students, meeting student expectations
Cost	Protect students from unnecessary expense, always considered in all instructional choices
Publish	Pressure, stress, less intrinsically rewarding, long turn around
Teaching	Favorite part
iPad	Used to hate Apple, prefers to read on tablets, easy access
Reports	Likes to organize, would make a good secretary, immediate rewards
Renewal	Wants to reinvigorate her teaching, sees technology as a way to jump start her teaching practice

Chapter Eight

Charles

> You can't be innovative in teaching without it being computerized or technologically laden or something like that, which is, again, another sad commentary on the status of my colleagues who think that somehow teaching innovation has to be electronically or technologically linked.
>
> Charles

> It is said that our schools are geared to "middle-class values," but this is a false and misleading use of terms. The schools less and less represent any human values, but simply adjustment to a mechanical system.
>
> (Goodman, 1971, p. 28)

Introducing Charles

Charles was the most challenging participant in this study. Charles did not distinguish between tools and technology but had come to see them as one and the same. It was somewhat like thinking of everything as a potential text to be analyzed and deconstructed (Kaufmann, 2011). By considering the meaning of a thing, it could be seen for what it was. It could be pulled apart and broken down to an essence, much like phenomenology attempted to do. When everything was a potential technology or tool, it must be carefully examined or the user becomes the used. Dial phones turned into cell phones and then into smartphones. So, in Charles's experience, there was an acknowledgement that everything was a kind of technology, but that people often failed to recognize things as such. Charles might even have gone so far as to say that we had been duped into believing that certain

things were not a technology so that we can buy something that was perceived to be a technology. Charles saw the ongoing replacement of the old with the new as a perpetuating turnstile of meaningless motion.

For Charles, teaching was far more than mere information transfer. Charles said,

> It seems that the undergraduates that we are usually dealing with here are not so deeply wedded to a traditional understanding of teaching and learning but instead see it as merely information transfer – it's like their heads get blown off – it's surprising the struggle to comprehend the possibility of teaching and learning as something other than what they have experienced, which is this data transfer or accountability measures or meeting goals and outcomes or doing well on the test of all of those things that collapse together to represent some kind of traditional understanding of teaching and learning that would be distinct from the tradition of the movie (Dead Poet Society) which is, the kind of perennialism that is represented there which is not the experience of most of our students. They experience a form of essentialism or something along those lines. It is still an overarching narrative out from under which they rarely escape because they can't, they can't conceptualize reality as something other than what has been presented to them. They can't critically understand it – they only sort of endure it, or reinforce it by enduring it or something – which is bizarre.

Charles saw most technology as a tool that reinforced the 'information transfer' aspect of what some believed to be learning, but for Charles, learning was something more

personal, much deeper, and longer lasting. Mere information transfer dehumanized the learning process and eliminated the need to evaluate, critique, and question the information being presented. This was something that Charles resisted, even though he felt it was too often a losing battle. Even if it was a battle that he could not win, he felt there was a kind of honor in fighting it.

Charles's experience with technology suggested that he often saw technology as a tool for oppression, and sometimes for manipulation and control. In other words, technology often prevented us from thinking for ourselves. While others might have argued that technology could expand our thinking, for Charles, it was more often a tool that stunted us, or at the very least, wasted our time and money on things that were unnecessary. For Charles, technology deflected our attention from the things upon which we should be focusing. Technology was, for Charles, a powerful distraction and disruptor of teaching, and living a good life.

Charles recognized tenure as an important part of the professor experience for himself and for others who passed through the academy as professors. When I member checked with Charles, he circled the phrase 'the professor experience' and suggested it sounded like a carnival ride. Of course, a carnival ride tends to be the kind of thing that one steps onto for a quick thrill whereas the professor experience, at least in his experience, was a much longer ride – though perhaps no less thrilling. When we talked about the place of tenure in the life of a professor, he would often speak of the tenure process as though it were something that happened to someone else. This could have been because the tenure process seemed rather distant to him, or it could have been that he did not want to reveal

too much about his own tenure process. Given how protective Charles was of his personal information, I cannot say for certain.

Charles's feelings about tenure were complicated. On the one hand, he saw tenure as an important part of academic freedom – or at least academic freedom was something he believed it should provide. He was skeptical about whether the tenure process was successful at securing academic freedom because by the time tenure arrived, the will to make use of that freedom had already been depleted or destroyed by the administration. In addition, the focus of tenure slowly turned away from meaningful teaching as more and more administrative tasks were bestowed on faculty, and those administrative tasks were changing and expanding – often as a result of technology. Charles believed that without tenure, professors often do whatever they were told, like flocks of sheep. In other words, they did not question what they were told to do out of fear of not being awarded tenure; then, once they were given protocols for how to behave and how to do things pre-tenure, they could no longer think for themselves post-tenure. So, by the time one achieved tenure, it was perhaps too late for free thinking, which meant there was no true academic freedom. For example, Charles said,

> If you're not tenured, you're going to do whatever is asked of you so you can get tenured. And by the time you get tenured, then it becomes the norm and you don't have to contest it anymore because that's what you're used to until, which obviously they're doing, or have been for the past decade, they'll change it on you. It's going to be whatever the next thing is going to be.

Charles was constantly on guard for how a process or technology could be used to rob the individual of her or his freedom. In this case, the tenure process was seen as a tool for getting the faculty to do what the administration wanted them to do. Tenure was the carrot that dangled before them, an irresistible treat for which some faculty would say or do almost anything. For Charles, technology played a role in this. Charles saw technology as something that made it increasingly easy for the administration to monitor what one did, and how much time was spent doing something. Charles saw technology as a tool that restricted the academic freedom of faculty. For Charles, the tenure process allowed the administration to get the faculty to do whatever it was they wanted them to do, often in the context of 'infusing technology' in the classroom. There were other equally insidious ways that the administration used technology to keep faculty busy. No task was too absurd, and almost no untenured faculty would say no. Technology was one of the tools that the administration used to curtail resistance.

Charles did not see the tenure process changing very much in his lifetime. When I asked him whether he thought digital media such as blogs would one day be given a place in the tenure process he had this to say:

> I don't see that yet. I wouldn't be surprised if it happened but I would, of course, furiously contest its being placed on the same field as teaching and scholarship. But I mean individuals can include that sort of thing under the current rubric. So I'm not sure why there would be a necessity to go to a fourth or a fifth, or whatever, element that focuses specifically on things like a blog. I mean a blog is like a diary. You're blathering about what you

> believe; fine, but that is not scholarship. That's opinionizing or whatever and that's fine, but it's not scholarship.

Charles didn't completely dismiss emerging media and technologies like blogs, but he did not see a place for them in the tenure process. Charles drew distinct lines between what counted as scholarship and what did not. For Charles, blogs did not count as something scholarly. Charles saw the tenure approval process as retaining some degree of integrity, and if it did not, Charles would surely stand against it. Though he saw tenure as a tainted process, it was also a necessary one. One the one hand, he wouldn't be terribly surprised to see digital artifacts such as blogs obtaining a more prominent place in the tenure process, but it was something he would fiercely contest. Charles had strong feelings about maintaining a clear difference between the work of scholarship and the opinion of an editorial. Even though many blogs did contain citations and serious scholarly work, Charles did not see them as scholarship.

Charles saw a connection between the tenure process and the importance of speaking up for what he believed. He said,

> They (academics) have autonomy whether they're a graduate student or the assistant professor, but I don't know that they understand that they have autonomy or perceive that it's a potentiality at all. My sense is that there's an increasing number of individuals that are taking marching orders and they might not even complain about it anymore. It used to be that you might gripe about it, but I'm not even sure individuals understand why griping would be an important thing to do anymore because they're so afraid of not getting tenure.

This quote highlighted the separation Charles saw between getting tenure and doing the right thing. Charles argued that professors should contest, and that doing so was an important part of their job; however, it was a part of the job that almost no one was willing to do. Contesting and challenging before tenure was too risky while contesting after tenure was either futile or forgotten.

In closing, Charles thought the tenure process was an essential part of maintaining the integrity of the academy; however, he did not see it as something that would necessarily continue as he believed it should. Charles also revealed that technology had the potential the play a negative role in the tenure process. Charles thought that technology was used to monitor and control faculty. Technology may have allowed the lines between scholarship and other work to blur for some, but, for Charles, the difference was obvious and distinct. Charles saw tenure as an important part of his professional experience if for no other reason than the fact that he might not have been able to do what he did without it (in other words, he believed he would have probably been fired long ago without it); however, he had concerns regarding how the tenure process had become diluted. He referenced his superior ratings when he went through the tenure process, and belittled the new process where one was merely given a 'meets' or 'not meets' when receiving (or not receiving) tenure.

Charles' Technology and Teaching Experience

Charles used technology, though it could be said that he was sometimes forced to use many technologies against his will. For Charles, it was less about the technology, and more about how it was used, or how it was enforced upon the user. Certain technologies are an unquestionable norm in Charles's professional life, and he found this infuriating.

Charles was especially mindful of how technology changed our expectations; however, for Charles it was more about the experience of constant and unnecessary change which was an assault, and the constant technological change was always disorienting. The cycles of upgrades and replacements for all kinds of technology often baffled Charles as he pondered what was wrong with what he was already using. He saw most upgrade experiences as a waste of time and money.

It's important to recall that, at times, Charles defined technology very broadly. He became frustrated when asked to limit his definition of technology to something that was strictly digital or modern. For Charles, the technology of chalk had been replaced by PowerPoint – another example of how a certain kind of administrative hegemony was applied via technology. Charles thought that chalk worked just fine (as did the blackboard that accompanied the chalk). Charles wanted to make sure I understood that technology was not always new. Because Charles could define almost anything he used as a kind of technology, he painted with a broad stroke. One observation about this approach was that it allowed Charles to control how technology was defined for his purposes. In other words, by controlling the definition of technology, he empowered himself a bit more, making choices about the technology he would use and putting aside (or openly criticizing) those he would not use.

Charles was annoyed with the suggestion from university administration that a tool such as PowerPoint was some kind of new and preferable tool for teaching. He said,

> I mean, if we honestly believe that a PowerPoint is an advancement in pedagogy then we're fooling ourselves. That's merely the restatement of data transfer, we're just putting it up on a screen somewhere. If we think

> the idiot in the business school who thinks that students should text questions rather than raising their hands in class is some sort of innovation, then we've lost the game entirely.

Charles noted the symbolism of referring to PowerPoint as a tool as he questioned who had the power to define it as such and why they might do so. In addition to seeing PowerPoint as a waste of time and resources, he saw other innovations commonly deployed on college campuses (such as clickers or student response systems) as another distraction from what they should be trying to do in the college classroom. Charles was also annoyed by the onslaught of other presentation technologies to which people flocked. Some of these technologies had been used by job candidates in Charles's department. Charles seemed to find this especially frustrating and said,

> It's just one of those things. So it enables the annoying features, features plural, that were not thinkable prior to. But because they are thinkable now, are enacted as though they're good to do. It's just mind boggling to me because that's just annoying. I mean it's annoying already to sit there and watch someone read their own screen rather than to talk authoritatively about an idea or a concept or a research project. But then to add to this, both sound and superfluous movement that frankly could give you a headache if you actually watched it time and time again when it goes back and forth and up and around, it's just stupid. And it's sanctioned, and that's what is really pissing me off.

Charles seemed to be saying too much attention was paid to giving a flashy presentation and in some cases perhaps the entire presentation was focused on flashiness, not content. This seemed to be an example of technology for the sake of technology, or even technology for the sake of salesmanship. Charles's experience of frustration was not entirely with the technology itself, but with our willingness to surrender to it when it contributed nothing or distracted us from what was important. For Charles, the frustration was with the technology and those who made it important or required.

Charles thought that the people who bought these new technologies should be held responsible for their actions. Charles saw no ethical responsibility in the people who bring in a new technology. The ongoing upgrades were a waste to Charles and he said,

> It's all under this guise, this sort of assumption that it has to be new perpetually in order for it to have value. It has to be updated. I'm not saying that anybody's research that requires some sort of a super computer or crunching some numbers and it's going to require a huge one. That's fine. But all I need is something to do typing on to write papers. I really don't need anything else. And so I'm not sure why the newest and latest Word version, whatever it's called, whatever point oh, I have to then re-navigate every time they update my computer. Well, it's not my computer, it's their computer. So I'm using what they give me.

Charles noted that his students were changing as a result of technology, and often not for the better as he said,

> They believe that the spell checker will check all their words, that they can do a grammar run and they don't have to reread their work. They think

> they can cut and paste stuff as though that's not plagiarism. They've excused themselves from the moral requirements, the ethical requirements because of the convenience of the machine and the access that they have data. So they – I think with justification within the system that allows them to do that, I mean this is only thinkable because the technology allows it to be thinkable. It makes it possible for them to do this sort of thing.

Charles seemed to be saying that technology allowed students to opt out of thinking for themselves. He went on further to say:

> They think that as long as they can search for stuff to answer questions they don't have to read the complexity of the argument. They just want to get the answer and just Google something from Wikipedia and they'll just find the answer, and then they're done so they don't struggle with the idea. They don't engage in the deeper, more complex troublesome, arduous, difficult, intellectual procedures, they want to find out the easiest way to get done and move on so that they can go shopping or Skype or whatever they're going to do.

Charles was often combative about technology and with those who forced it upon him. He fretted that with technology, more and more people were monitoring what he was doing. Charles said he has felt this way long before privacy issues became a general concern in the population. He was also taken aback at how much money was spent on technology. Charles said,

> It seems there are plenty of people to check in on what everyone else is doing – technology makes it easy to do that. And it starts at the top. And there is always money for technology projects. When money is left over, it is put towards technology. It's farcical. The consequence of this is that we are creating an experience of convenience and if it is not convenient for the student, it doesn't get funding. All this, all this, online teaching, and I suppose some of it is valid in some ways, is antithetical to what I do – it is at odds with what I try to do with my teaching. So, in a way, so, you might say that these technologies are Janus-faced.

Charles's comments on technology made it seem that he was mostly settled into the notion that technology was a bad thing; however, a closer reading tells us that it was how we human beings both pick, deploy, and use technologies that was frustrating to Charles. In the quotation above, Charles pointed towards the surveillance possibilities of technology. The technology of surveillance was hidden even when someone began to use it. For Charles, this started with the people 'at the top' of the university. Charles was aware of this and was uncomfortable with it. For Charles, this watching over the shoulder came at a high price, including the loss of academic freedom. Faculty began to restrict what they did because they were probably being watched. It was a form of self-policing brought about by technology. The faculty members could not be sure who was using this technology, or when it would be used against them; therefore, they were always vigilant. They never let their guard down, and an ensuing paranoia was created.

For Charles, surveillance and complexity were tied together through technology. Charles talked about a program where faculty had to enter large amounts of data about

their classes (as well as publications, presentations, offices held, service rendered, etc.). When it first started, the data collection was paper-based. Over the years, the data collection shifted from paper to a variety of different electronic forms. Charles described the process and the company who provided changes from time to time, and that each time it became more complicated as more data were collected. The process also took more time to complete. This was demeaning to Charles, and he encouraged his colleagues not to complete the forms. This process also had a sinister element for Charles, who said,

> Micromanagement, control, limiting the imagination of faculty to understand that their job is other than what the administration wants it to be. The more junior faculty fall under this rubric idea of multiple screens the more they're compliant with the idea of surveillance even though they may not understand it as surveillance.

During member checking, Charles was quick to say that level of micromanagement was actual, real, and not a secret. Charles thought that the university was becoming much more like the corporate world. And Charles was unafraid to say so. When Charles said that the job of faculty was something other than what university administration might want it to be, he seemed to be suggesting that faculty members (such as himself) need freedom in order to do what they need to be doing. And Charles believed that part of what faculty members should be doing was questioning the purchase of technology, the distribution of funds by the administration, and the declining status of faculty in the academy. They should not have to worry about who is watching over their shoulder or becoming data-entry clerks.

Charles pointed towards the distribution of university funds (specifically towards technology projects) as a central problem. Because new technologies were always emerging, it was not possible for anyone to keep up with where the money was spent, and what was available. Technology enhanced a rat-race mentality, where schools were competing against each other to have the latest technologies – and this was happening in a time of fewer financial resources for universities. It was not about quality (quality of teaching, for example), but was instead about who had the newest technology. Charles saw money being spent on more and more technology at the end of each fiscal year, while he and his colleagues went without a raise. Because Charles had not had a raise in six years (at the time of this writing), he was stunned to see administrators put more money towards technology. Charles saw this as further proof that the university did not value his work, but instead valued technology. Charles saw a rush towards the shallow and superfluous and an abandoning of the substantive and important.

In the final portion of the quotation, Charles turned his gaze towards the convenience factor of online learning. Charles saw the administrative powers of the university making buying decisions based on whether or not something would make the university experience convenient for the student body. For Charles, much of online learning was about convenience for the student and sometimes for the faculty. In other words, universities did it because it would presumably make it easier for the student who no longer has to go to class, or even be present on campus. Charles concluded the quotation by saying that while some online teaching may be useful, the overall experience of online learning was the complete opposite of what he offered. This suggested that Charles felt belittled by the university. Regardless of how self-motivated one might be,

encouragement from colleagues was important. The absence of this encouragement was hard on Charles.

Charles described his teaching style as maieutic. Maieutic teaching is a Socratic method of teaching where one is pressed to apply logic through intense, unrelenting dialogue. When I inquired whether he felt technology could help or hurt the maieutic experience in his teaching he said,

> It has so destroyed the existence of the possibility of maieutic interaction that they look at you dumbfoundedly because they don't understand what it is to be a questioning member in interlocution. They're just waiting to be fed the information just as though it was a feed online or something. Or they're just waiting to watch the video and dim the light and turn on the PowerPoint so they can go to sleep or surf, or whatever they're going to do. It's noticeable in the past twenty years to me that you have to work that much harder in order to demonstrate the viability and the value of maieutic interaction. Sometimes that works and sometimes they still look at you like you've got three heads.

Charles felt he must work harder to win the attention of students, and there was no guarantee that he would be successful. To teach his way required comfort with one's self as well as a high level of confidence. It also required the development of the skillful art of conversation, where quick wit made things work. For Charles, this was not something that could happen on the discussion board online.

Charles was fairly comfortable using e-mail and depended upon it as a primary communication tool, but even e-mail had a downside. For Charles, this downside came in

the form of more e-mail. Charles recounted how e-mail was originally sold to everyone as a way to save paper, but questioned the veracity of this claim, especially since Charles frequently printed out many items that he received via e-mail. Along the same lines, Charles did not own a Kindle or similar device and had no intention of buying one. He talked briefly about an experience where a student had purchased an eBook for his class but that the page numbers did not match up with the paper-based book, causing confusion for both parties. This experience caused him to rule out eBooks for any future classes.

When Charles considered the nature of service work in the academy, he saw an ever-expanding mountain of work, work that was increased at least partially due to technology. He said:

> Everything is put online. I mean you can't do committee work anymore unless you go onto a server somewhere that has documents and what not. You can't conduct business without having something in there to access or pull up or something like that. And because of the perceived ease that that provides then administrators apparently feel as though you should be able to do even more service.

Charles was saying that technology had made it possible to do more work, and as a result, faculty members were doing more work. It was difficult to distinguish between work that was brought about by the technology and work that was brought about by the administration. Charles seemed to suggest that they work hand-in-hand; however, he was cautious about attributing too much emphasis to either one. Perhaps it was simply that one enabled the other.

Charles was quick to point towards the increasing amount of money that was spent on technology in higher education and critical of cuts being made throughout the academy. He said,

> States around the country keep cutting higher ed budgets. Higher Ed institutions keep spending huge amounts of money on technology so it only takes a particular kind of leader to say, let's not spend all of that money with this kind of frequency and move the chips around so that students wouldn't have to pay so much for tuition or they would increase scholarship possibilities for those who are deserving, or whatever. But the larger issue, of course, is the legislators who simply, they don't want to fund higher education. They see grant whoring as the appropriate outcome of Higher Ed faculty.

Charles was mindful of the important role that government played in funding higher education. He acknowledged that much of the crisis was driven by elected officials who would like to see education defunded.

From this section, we can see that Charles had a problematic relationship with technology, but much of the dissonance of his experience was driven by administration, policy, and the political forces of the technophiles within the culture of the academy. It might seem that Charles was someone who completely opposed technology; however, a closer look revealed his views were much more complicated. Charles enjoyed the benefits that technology brought society, but he was painfully aware that technology was used to enforce a regime of oppression. Charles knew that he was in a fortunate position to say the things that he said.

Though Charles had an impressive publication record, his primary professional experience was that of a teacher. When people asked him what he did for a living, he almost always replied "I teach." He usually resisted talking about what exactly he taught (unless he was pressed to do so) because, as he said, "Responses vary widely." He talked about the rolling eyes or curt responses or even general surprise that one could make a living doing such things as being a professor or teacher in his field. Charles felt underappreciated by society at large and by his college and university specifically. There was a sense from Charles that few people understood his work, and that fewer people were interested in understanding it. Charles felt somewhat betrayed and misunderstood.

When Charles reflected on his teaching, he reflected on a time early in his teaching career, when many of his students were older than he was:

> I distinctly recall students complaining when I would return papers and they had to write on the topic of political or philosophical ideas and if they spelled a word incorrectly or the grammar was wrong or the wrong word was used or something and I noted it, not in a red pen, but I noted it, I recall more than one or two students complaining, that this was not an English class, this was an Ed class and so I had no right to critique their grammar or their spelling or whatever which I found fascinating and troubling but they were, you know, they didn't like being challenged. There is this very clear assumption that the students come in with, then and now, which is consumeristic, which is where they pay their tuition and my job is to provide them with the data they paid for…good luck!

Charles was surprised and disappointed that students saw dividing lines in what was and was not appropriate for him to comment on in their papers. It was as though he was only supposed to comment about issues relating to his specific field in their writing, and crossing the line into correcting English was outside the bounds of what he was supposed to do. Charles did not draw lines of distinction between what was open for critique and what was not. For Charles, this was part of the joy of being a teacher – and it was also part of a professor's responsibility.

When I asked Charles whether he might continue teaching if he won the lottery, he had this to say:

> Well, I enjoy teaching and it does require a kind of engagement intellectually with both material and context of what teaching requires which is a kind of immediacy of thinking on your feet and being sure to demonstrate what you're saying is true and demonstrate that you actually have the knowledge. But then I sure as hell wouldn't worry about doing any service or worry about publishing necessarily unless I really, really wanted to or whatever which certainly isn't the case now. So, probably, yes is the answer to that question.

When Charles answered this question he did not hesitate – it was clear that he would have no problem giving up the service work of the academy. While Charles suggested that he would perhaps continue to write on things that he cared about (which may or may not be the kind of things he writes about for the academy), it seemed to me that it was not something he would likely continue.

Here, then, is another example of someone who feels that they would continue to teach even after winning the lottery. Charles did not really think of teaching as a career until well into graduate school. He said he had many outstanding teachers, but did not think that he would end up doing what they did for a living, or at least he did not think he would end up teaching much of what they taught. Charles was proud of his teaching prowess, but he was proud of his other accomplishments too.

Charles did not mention conflicts in his personal life. Even when I delicately inquired, he seemed to have nothing to say about such things. Instead, the greatest conflict Charles seemed to have was with the university administration, and the expectations of the administration. Early on in our first interview, Charles suggested that he had been downgraded to a position of data entry clerk. As we talked about his job duties, he had this to say:

> I would say that I teach classes, that I do scholarly work, and that I spend far too much time on administrative tasks. There seems to be more and more of it. I would add that I complete a lot of forms. That I am doing a lot of data entry. I am required to complete and submit a variety of forms about what I am doing. I have to constantly justify and explain everything, and that this kind of mindless work has increased steadily over the past ten years. And it, it is a kind of diminution of what I am professionally. It is true for all of us, or at least I think it is.

Charles felt that his profession was spiraling downward. By spending so much time doing something like data entry, he felt marginalized. This served as a powerful and frustrating conflict for Charles. It could also be said that at this stage in his career, where he was a

Full Professor, it was especially insulting to be asked to do data entry. Charles made some references to the role that technology had played in promoting the data entry work, but put most of the blame on the administration of the university. Charles said,

> We must constantly fight to justify our existence. And all this data entry is one of the ways they have us justifying what we do. We are in a time of hyper-professionalism, and it's, it's not just the academy or universities that are going through this, it's probably all fields who, who see themselves under attack, so they have to justify. Unless you are an endowed chair, which is more common at private universities, you will have to justify yourself. And that is another reason why we are getting more and more part-time instructors. And I can't blame them for wanting to work and make a living, but we are at a point where everything has already been squeezed. We haven't gotten a raise in five years – that is absurd. And yet they want us to do more work, and technology plays a role in that – the expectation that we can do more with less. More data entry!

Charles had been honored with a variety of prestigious awards and had also served as president of important educational groups, yet he felt that this was of little consequence at his university. He said,

> It's only outside of this university that I'm actually considered good. Here I'm just considered a pain in the ass, which I'm not debating that point. The veracity of that claim might still stand, but this is not a place that gives credit for the kind of work that I do. I'd be lying if I said it didn't

> discourage me, but I try not to allow it to discourage me too much. Sometimes you take that discouragement and turn it into a kind of perseverance in the face of it and so in that sense it might be energizing in a perverse way.

This was another example of Charles feeling underappreciated. His work was sought out by various outside organizations, but his home institution paid him little mind.

In one interview with Charles, we talked about how he introduced what he did for a living to someone. He said:

> If I'm asked I say that I teach or something along those lines so as not to be as pretentious as I may otherwise be. It may be a kind of fake humility, but I really don't intend people to just…my experience is that it tends to shut down conversation with people that don't think they are worthy of having a conversation any more, for whatever reason. So that just becomes more of a problem than anything else.

Charles was sensitive to how people responded to what he did. From our conversation, it seemed that he was careful not to use the word professor because there was an air of pretention to it in some circles. Rather than having a conversation end abruptly with someone who might be intimidated by a person who was a professor, Charles was interested in having an exchange with someone outside his professional persona. In other words, he preferred to have a conversation between two human beings who thought for themselves, rather than a conversation based on hierarchical definitions and demands that society constructed. Charles was content with simply stating that he taught, and did not

mention that he taught at a college unless someone pressed him. He certainly avoided addressing the topic he taught, as he felt it would spark judgment.

Later in the interview, Charles explained his thoughts about the title "professor":

> I'm fine with professor. That's who I am and what I do, but other people tend to think differently about the word because they don't understand what it means.

Charles explained that when he wanted to startle someone, he might say that he worked for the Corporation of Such and Such University. This was Charles's way of pointing a finger towards the increasingly burdensome economic pressure that he and his colleagues were under. Because state funding continued to disappear, and because the kind of work he did was not usually funded by grants, he felt that the university administration saw him as a financial burden.

When Charles picked a single word to describe his overall persona he picked curmudgeon. He did not think that being a curmudgeon was in conflict with being a professor. In fact, he believed they fit together nicely. Charles even said, "I couldn't be the professor I am if I wasn't a curmudgeon." When I pressed him on what this meant, he said:

> I interrogate much that comes across my desk that perceives itself to be accurate and true and noble and point out why it's not, and in that process you get pissed off all the time because people don't realize just how stupid they are. I'm increasingly peeved by the assumptiveness of administrators or colleagues who somehow seem to think that what they've put down on paper has apparent value when in fact it does not.

Charles is in conflict with how he sees other professors in the academy. His own beliefs about graduate education or the purpose of a university were conflict with those of most people at the institution. When I asked him what he believed to be the purpose of graduate education, he said,

> It seems to me that graduate education ought to be about broadening and deepening one's understanding of inter- or trans-disciplinary investigations but I'm repeatedly told or it's indicated to me repeatedly that the purpose is to narrow and narrow and narrow and so hyper-specialize so as to not need certain kinds of coursework or certain kinds of investigations.

Just as Charles did not want to be narrowed down and categorized based on the definitions of others, he did not want to see similar things happen to graduate education. Charles seemed to be saying that he did not want students or faculty to be so limited in their outlook of what it meant to receive a graduate education. The narrowing of one's focus, the limiting of one's interests, and the setting aside of courses that may have initially seemed to fall outside the scope of one's focus and interests were troubling trends to Charles.

I asked Charles to reflect on his personal experience of teaching. He said,

> I don't know that it's a process, per se, but it's reflective in the sense of determining what's said, how it's said, when it's said in order to rethink the audience, the students, whether they're undergraduate or graduate students, in whatever the context of the discussion was about, and figuring out ways of saying things more clearly or more humorously or more

> directly or more confrontationally sometimes in order to challenge folks to think…well, not just to think, but if we get there, then think differently about ideas that they've brought in with them or assumptions that they brought in with them.

Charles's work as a teacher was usually powered by the notion that students and faculty alike should always be questioning what they believed to be true.

Though Charles enjoyed language and words, he was cautious about what words meant in the age of easy Internet searching. When I asked Charles about whether he thought technology changed or shaped his identity, he said:

> Oh, I'm sure it does – just, that I have an identity. If you do a search for me on Google you will far more readily find me than you would Bob Smith or some other generic name simply because my name is an odd name. It has nothing to do with the quality of my work necessarily or any influence that I may or may not have. It's just the oddity of my name means you'll get page upon page upon page upon page apparently.

Charles pointed out how technology shaped the availability of one's identity for public consumption. Because he had an unusual name, it was quite easy to pull up a variety of web pages containing his work, his talks, and fragments of his professional being. Charles mused on what this might mean in the greater scheme of things. For example, did it give him an advantage in that his work was more easily searchable? Charles seemed to be on the fence about this, but he did believe that being widely available on the Internet shaped him in some way; he just wasn't sure how.

Charles very much wanted to bring about change. Unfortunately, he felt that the kind of change he wanted was not coming. Charles felt that his ideas and suggestions were undervalued at his institution, but he offered a glimmer of hope when he talked about how things tend to go in cycles:

> People are going to glom onto it because it's new and innovative and you don't have to be, it's like this, I don't even know what they're calling it, the name of it, but it's the commercial where the kid is sitting in a class and he wants to take another direction, so we just go to this online sort of version, virtual university or whatever like that. And I think that's catching on now. I don't know that it's going to sustain itself because the quality simply isn't there. And at some point I have to have a kind of Deweyan belief that quality will trump convenience. I mean, if I give up on that, I might as well shoot myself.

This quote suggested that Charles was holding out hope that quality would win the day, and that online learning was unlikely to be a part of a quality solution.

Being a professor was a big part of Charles's experience, but he would not want to think of it as a role that he played. For Charles, to suggest that he was trying to be something would suggest that he was not being his true self. Charles was who he was, which happened to be a professor, a raconteur, and arguably a voice of reason within the academy. Charles did not distinguish between these roles, and simply saw these different pieces as a single whole. When I asked whether his early ideals of being a professor had lived up to the reality, he said,

> I think now it is. It certainly wasn't at the beginning because you can never start something and expect to quote/unquote master it or have the level of experience or knowledge or depth and breadth of experience that would inform even better than what it is what you do. I mean, you simply don't have it. It's like Dewey's comparison of immaturity as mere lack when you compare children to adults and say children are immature as though it's a negative when in fact all it is a narrative claim. Of course they're immature, they're children. Well of course a starting professor is going to make a mistake or have to get their feet wet or face challenges that they're going to have to work through. And in that continual working through, one will more clearly understand both the limits and potentialities of what you're doing and how you're doing it.

And when I asked whether technology could help or hurt a professor that was just starting out, he said,

> If anything, it stunts the actual interaction because people are sitting in a dark room looking at a stupid PowerPoint presentation and thinking that that's teaching…so there's no growth in that. There's no actual growth there.

Charles saw technology as something that stunts the intellectual growth of new faculty. He did not see technology playing a role in blending identities, partially because he was skeptical that identities blend. Instead, Charles saw himself and others in a more authentic way. He was an individual who interacted with others. He was always the same person and preferred not to think of himself as having separate roles. Charles talked about

this as another part of his work: getting others to think, not in terms of their expected roles, but what they think their roles should be. He said,

> One of the big challenges for me is in challenging students so that they understand what the challenge means, because they haven't been challenged in what I would take to be a substantive way. They've only been challenged with pecuniary expectations on how to check off the rubric or be sure that they've covered the 17 steps they need to cover to write an essay or any and all that crap. They do not conceive of themselves as budding intellectuals. They just see themselves as students. Or even their professors. Not even as an intellectual but as a job description or a role.

This quote captured Charles's resistance to preconceived notions of what it should mean to be anything – a professor, a student, an intellectual. Charles suggested that this was something the individual should go about formulating throughout their lives and that it should always be a work in progress.

Summary

Charles was the most difficult participant for me to objectively analyze for this project. It took more bracketing and long slow walks through the park than I thought it would. His experience was complicated, and while I might have been able to sometimes predict what he was going to say about something, I was less confident in my ability to derive the full meaning of his experience. Still, Charles took his role as a professor very seriously. As he did not distinguish between his identities, or understand teaching as a performance for which he was always "on," I had a hard time saying or proving that he

was a different person at different times, either professionally or personally. Charles resisted most technologies, but his resistance was more a rally against methods of control and coercion than against the technology itself – though for Charles, there was almost no difference between the two. The digital world was full of tools and methods of control and manipulation, and Charles asserted that these tools were created, deployed and used with intention. As a result, Charles planned to continue his resistance. In fact, he hoped and believed that others would eventually join him in this resistance.

Table 8. Charles' Codes

Waste of time	No added value, upgrading is perpetual, always relearning, meaningless
Capital allocation	Misuse of funds, no raises for faculty, extra funds always go to technology projects
Prestige	Important positions, doing outstanding work in all roles,
Manipulation	Administration, technology, control
Appreciation	Lack of, only appreciated outside of his university,
PowerPoint	Stupid tool, expected, mindless
Consumerism	Driven by technology
Publish	Important, a way to measure success
Writing	Part of the job, might prefer to write about other things
Technology as a tool	Blurring the line between, almost anything can be seen as
E-mail	Unending, informal, time consuming
Socratic	Preferred way to teach, essential to his work, often misunderstood

Chapter Nine

Discussion

> In truth, however hard you try, you can never retrieve an experience in full. As a famous line by the ancient philosopher Heraclitus has it, you cannot step into the same river twice. Even if you return to the same spot on the bank, different water flows in upon you at every moment. Similarly, to see the world exactly as you did half an hour ago is impossible, just as it is impossible to see it from the point of view of a different person standing next to you.
>
> (Bakewell, 2011, p. 33)

Exploring the Tenured Faculty Experience

For the final section, I summarized the experience of technology, teaching, and tenure of the five faculty members in this study. My intended audience was IDT workers in higher education. Faculty and university administrators may also glean useful information from these pages. Phenomenology is a method for exploration, or a way to better understand a lived human experience (Creswell, 2008). Wolcott wrote that 'good qualitative research should confound issues, revealing them in their complexity rather than reducing them to simple explanation" (p.32) and Van Manen explicitly stated that phenomenological research is a "search for what it means to be human." (p.12). This is what I attempted to do here.

How Did These Faculty Negotiate Technology?

The main research question of this study asked how tenured faculty negotiated which technologies entered their lives. The participants in this study suggested that a diverse

mix of factors influenced their technology choices. These factors were often highly personal in nature and often closely linked with their personal and professional experience with technology, as other studies have suggested (Allen et al., 2012; Bain & McNaught, 2006; Chizmar & Williams, 2001; B. Lawrence & Lentle-Keenan, 2013). This section looked at the main factors that influenced their technology choices. This section is divided into sub-sections named for the themes that emerged in the interview data. These factors were grouped into the following categories:

- Cost
- The Time Factor
- Environmental Impact
- Teaching and Life Philosophy
- Impact on family and students
- Physical and Tactile
- The Internet Experience

The participants in this study suggested that choices in their personal lives were closely linked to choices in their professional ones. For the participants in this study, professional and personal reactions to technology were often closely aligned.

Cost

While none of the professors in this study taught economics, their individual economic reality was an important factor in influencing the technologies that came into their lives. While there is considerable literature on how consumers navigate technologies based on cost (Park & Kim, 2003), IDT researchers have not considered this at the individual

faculty level. In each case of my study, the university spent more money providing technology for them than they would spend for themselves. Some faculty found this to be puzzling; some found it to be a perk; and others found it to be bordering on criminal. Though Bert was open to technology, he could not stop from thinking about it in strictly practical terms. Part of this practicality related to the financial cost. For example, Bert considered the economic cost of changing technologies (upgrading, for example) before buying something new. If the technology did not allow him to do something he could not already do, he would not buy it. For Patricia, Matt, and Sandra, the economic impact of their technology choices on students was always in the forefront of their minds. It would be unthinkable for any of them to introduce a new technology that required their students to purchase a technology for their class, partly because this might potentially mean that the students would suffer economically a result (Burdman, 2005). Charles was perhaps the most vocal about what he perceived to be the negative economic impact of technology. Charles saw a steady flow of university capital going towards technology projects and services with little meaningful return to the university. Charles felt this was unacceptable, and resisted many technologies as a result. Many studies have cited this as a problem within higher education (Billot, 2010; Holton & Phillips, 1995; Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, & August, 2012) but Charles zeroed in on it very strongly. In addition, Charles felt that the money spent on technology might contribute to lowering the quality of education, something that others have suggested in the literature (Martin, 2011).

Interestingly, the professors in this study did not consider technology to be a potential tool for lowering the cost of college for their students. They used eReserves to distribute

documents, but they also required students to purchase books for every class, and, more often than not, multiple books. While most were open to using web resources in their teaching, none had moved to using only free web resources for a class. In addition, none had tried to use eBooks for a class, though only Charles was actively against using eBooks. Some of the faculty in this study had eReaders. Sandra even preferred reading research and books on an eReader; however she would not ask her students to purchase one.

Cost was also a factor for what participants would buy for their own personal use. High priced technologies (like the newest smartphone) were generally not a priority. Interestingly, faculty members with children were somewhat less restrictive on technology purchases for their own children. For example, Bert recognized that having the latest and greatest smartphone was an important part of his son's identity. So, even though Bert was not compelled to buy a smartphone for himself, he made an allowance for his son. Patricia and Matt wanted to restrict the introduction of too many technologies in their homes because they were concerned about the potentially negative consequences of their children spending too much time with technologies, but it is important to note that cost was a factor for them as well.

IDT professionals should consider cost when recommending technology to faculty. For example, student response systems (also known as clickers) may require students to purchase a response device to participate in class. Even though the cost may seem modest (averaging between $29 - $50), faculty in this study resisted even a small technology cost that students would have to bear. As IDT professionals, we need to be prepared to

account for the money used to purchase a particular technology, even if it is something we are loaning to the faculty. Charles would want to know who paid for it.

This section on cost showed that the relationship between faculty technology experience and financial cost is complicated. The faculty in this study viewed most technologies as expensive. Much attention was paid to how long something may last, and participants questioned whether or not a technology should be replaced just because something new was available. In a way, these faculty members made poor consumers, as they are unlikely to be influenced or swayed by the emergence of new products. IDT professionals should be fully prepared to discuss the financial aspects of a technology with faculty who request that information (which might include maintenance, upgrades, power use, replacement cost, and how long until it will be obsolete).

The Time Factor

Every participant mentioned multiple conflicts with time, and how little time they had for the superfluous. Much research confirms this experience amongst faculty (Gmelch, 1993; Jacobs, 2004; Schoenfeld & Magnan, 1992). Of course, what activities qualified as superfluous varied significantly between participants; however, there was a consistent feeling of worry among participants that if they spent too much time on any particular technology, their time would be wasted. One common experience among participants was that many technologies consumed time without their even being aware of it. Participants saw this wasted time as something for which there was no compensation, recognition, or reward. Matt felt that he had to carefully guard his time, because he would jump from blog to blog, reading brief items of interest until perhaps hours of his day had been wasted. Patricia also limited the kinds of technology that came into her personal life,

because she was protective of her time. In contrast, Sandra had recently started taking in more technology. In fact, for years, Sandra had a policy of not responding to e-mails on the weekend; now that she had a newly-acquired iPad, however, she found herself frequently responding to e-mails any time of day or night, including weekends. While Sandra suggested that she only did this for e-mails that did not require a long response, even these short e-mail responses took time. Sandra pointed out that a device that was always on (such as an iPad) did not require the boot time of a traditional PC. For Sandra, one only needed to open the iPad case and begin typing. Bert and Charles had rather different stances on what technologies they used, but both were aware of the limits of time. Both resisted any technology that did not fit with their personal take on time. Time was precious and worth protecting.

For all participants, time was a deeply personal thing (Levine, 1998) and being mindful of the limitations of time was perhaps the most important thing to learn early on in their careers. Participants agreed that time management had a long lasting impact on one's career in the academy. Bert pointed out that the job of a professor was unending, and he usually worked on multiple projects at the same time. This nagging, gnawing sense of not utilizing every moment of time to do something productive seemed to cause high levels of stress in the participants of this study.

The academy operated in multiple 'time zones' and this caused challenges for faculty (Taylor, 2002). For the teaching part of the job, the work was tied to a semester or quarter. Weeks were carefully planned out in advance, with deadlines placed throughout the season. Service work also had a schedule that was frequently driven by attending meetings, writing and submitting reports, and implementing changes to policies or

procedures. The unrelenting pressures of a timeline also drove writing, publishing, and presenting. The faculty members in this study negotiated with these overlapping timelines throughout a given year, and much of the negotiations revolved around the limited amount of time they felt they had.

The lived experience of these faculty members suggested that some technologies blurred the line between productivity and frivolousness. This is documented in the general population as well (Davis, 2000). For example, one might start off reading a research article from a web-enabled device (a laptop in a coffee shop, for example). One might become bored with the paper and instead go to the Internet to look at something more interesting or entertaining. Or, one might jump from one article to another article of interest, never returning to the original work being studied. The ability to jump from media to media was relatively new, and while some participants felt they had developed the discipline needed to manage the temptation of moving to something else, that discipline was something to which they paid careful attention. While multitasking has become common practice for many people (Salvucci & Taatgen, 2010), the faculty members in this study seemed to feel that multitasking carried too many risks to use as a strategy for getting more done.

Most of the faculty members spoke about how much time they spent in the library when they worked on their graduate degrees. Most spoke of this experience with a fair amount of nostalgia, suggesting that time spent in the library was time spent away from everything else. For most, time spent in the library was an experience of isolation – not in the sense of being lonely, but in the sense that there were very few distractions to take them away from their work. All participants admitted that today they rarely visited the

library. They communicated with the librarians via e-mail. They looked at articles online (though Charles often printed them). Sandra talked about how she had for years taken paper-based journals from the library and brought them to her classes in an effort to show students what a physical, paper-based journal looked like. For Sandra, this bound copy made the experience of research and scholarship more real for her students; however, she had started questioning whether or not this was something she would continue to do or if it would even be possible in the coming years.

For Sandra, and for others in this study, there was a sense that some technologies had allowed them to gain time, particularly for research. Sandra even felt that she was able to read research articles faster on her iPad, though she was not sure why. All the participants mentioned that in addition to not spending time walking to the library to find articles, it was much faster to pull up articles over the Internet. Curiously, Matt and Charles continued to visit the library (though much less frequently) when they wanted to do serious scholarly work. Matt did this more so than Charles, and Matt was also more inclined to visit his neighborhood library, or the library associated with another university that was closer to his home. Even Charles admitted that research and scholarship was much easier now that one could pull up things in an instant; however, he still preferred reading paper-based articles.

Sandra pointed out that she would find herself reading in shorter segments now that she had an e-reader. She could easily take out her iPad and read something because it required no boot time, and because the device served a number of other purposes. She talked about taking the device to the gym and reading articles as she did her exercise.

This might have also been possible with paper-based articles, but it was not something she had tried until she did it with the iPad.

In the eyes of most participants, technology also played a role in taking time by increasing the amount and quality of required work. As Excel had become more complex, the reports some participants created became more complicated. As the technological complexity increased, more time was spent just learning the tools and putting the information together. While new technologies may have eventually become easier to navigate with practice and training, some faculty saw the time expended in getting to this point, as better spent in other ways. Some of the participants questioned the value of new features and new possibilities if the results did not add real value to the final product, revealing a disconnect between the value that administrators saw and the value that the faculty saw in the use of technology. It should be noted that the faculty members were less likely to resist something that a chair or dean requested – regardless of their rank as Associate or Full Professors. Matt was a good example of someone who enjoyed organizing things in an Excel spreadsheet, but even he worried that spending too much time on such tasks was counterproductive.

Technology made it possible to multitask, and this multitasking sometimes involved the mixing of business and pleasure. Charles and Bert (both Full Professors) had the least trouble turning things off. Bert believed that people were not controlled by technology, and that we made decisions to turn things on or off. Charles took a slightly different approach and actively hoped to unplug things as often as possible, metaphorically speaking. Charles suggested that he was happy to be distracted and looked forward to the demand of his dog or anything that would take him away from his desk and technology.

Generally speaking, studies that looked at multitasking suggest it lowers the effectiveness of concentration (Hembrooke & Gay, 2003) but studies in IDT have not looked at the how multitasking mixes business and pleasure amongst faculty.

The faculty in this study wanted to have control over their time and how it was spent. For some, technology was a time saver, making it easier to manage time or to get more done. For others, technology dissolved time, consciously or unconsciously. There was also the time commitment needed to learn the technology. This is an example of the Janus-faced nature of technology (Arnold, 2003), where technology offered both good and bad things to its users . Bert's approach of putting the onus on the individual, suggesting that we are each responsible for how we use technology, takes the burden of responsibility off the technology and places it directly on the shoulders of the user. Charles's stance to shut down as many technologies as possible before they have a chance to sink their hooks into one's psyche was a more active approach. The other participants took a cautious and mindful approach to time and technology.

The experience of 'technology time,' – in other words, time spent with technology -- suggested that some work legitimacy was lost with technology. This sense of work legitimacy stemmed less from the kind of work being done, and had more to do with the kind of technology that might be used for the work. For participants, technology-enhanced publishing platforms such as open journals lacked the legitimacy of more traditionally published journals that are released in paper. While an online journal might have the same selection criteria as the printed journal, the incorporation of technology had a lessening effect on the academic heft or prestige of the online version. There was a sense that the appearance of too much technology in teaching, writing, or working in

general may somehow lessen the worthiness of the work itself. While it seemed that the professors in this study made conscious decisions about how much time could be allocated to technology-enhanced or technology-related projects, there was an undercurrent of subtle resistance that suggested technology would somehow undermine their work.

For my participants, teaching was an art or craft (Tom, 1980), and they were artists and craftsmen. The process of making their art often took long stretches of time. To teach in this way was to teach without rushing the process, allowing things to happen in a natural and technologically-unenhanced way. For my participants, the process of teaching followed a certain rhythm, a rhythm that allowed for improvisation and change. For the faculty in this study, many technologies seemed to interrupt the natural flow of their teaching styles, dragging the students in very specific directions. This kind of teaching seemed to lack some of the mystery that enlivened their regular classrooms. Even though some technologies might have made things happen faster for the participants, working with the technology was less elegant. For them, teaching meant great abundances of time spent, but offered rewards that made the expenditure of time worthwhile.

Environmental Impact

The theme of environmentalism was more prevalent with Patricia and Matt, but it came up with all participants in some capacity. For Patricia and Matt, the environmental impact of a technology was something to consider before making a purchase for work or personal use. Also, thinking environmentally meant considering the energy use of a device as well as whether or not a device could be recycled at the end of its life. Neither Matt nor Patricia owned a smartphone at the time of this research. They both owned and

used rather old phones that they had been using for many years. Both defended their phone as a useful technology that allowed them to stay in touch with others to the degree that they wanted. For Patricia, it was acceptable to have a quick phone conversation while walking her children to school, but she did not want to get caught up in responding to e-mails as she walked with her children on the sidewalks of their neighborhood. While environmental concerns were not a significant part of Charles's experience, he did briefly mention that so much technology ends up in the landfill and that he did not want to contribute to that. Sandra was rare in that she admitted, with some degree of embarrassment, that she had never really given a lot of thought to environmental issues related to her technology or lifestyle choices. She did point out, however, that for many years she had printed research articles out for reading and highlighting, and, since she got the iPad, she did not feel as though she needed to print things out anymore. While this was just a slight nod towards saving trees in our conversation, it was something she had noticed and saw as a positive environmental outcome for her technology use.

Teaching and Life Philosophy: Lifeworld and worldview

When looking at the unique perspective of experience with technology, it was clear that these faculty tended to have well-thought out personal life philosophies regarding technology, another consideration well documented in the literature (Allen et al., 2012; Bain & McNaught, 2006; B. Lawrence & Lentle-Keenan, 2013; Roblyer et al., 2010). Participants had thought long and hard about why and how they did things, and what it meant in the greater context of their lives. These personal life philosophies were rich and complicated. Their lifeworlds coexisted with technology as much as they were encompassed by it.

Matt seemed very happy that many technologies had improved the world. He referenced things like healthcare, which offered a huge improvement in many people's quality of life. But he was quick to point out that technology had a dark side. Matt talked about how technology had enabled people to live much longer, but often in a greatly diminished capacity. He had serious ethical concerns about what many of the life extension technologies had done to people and to society. For Matt, there was always a fine line where technology ceased to be useful and instead became intrusive, abusive, or exploitative. While Matt was comfortable making decisions for himself, he felt that others were swayed by the false promises of technology. In addition, Matt worried that technologies enhanced excessive consumer consumption. This tied in with his concern for the environment; however, Matt was more concerned with the human drive to consume unnecessarily and how technology made it so easy. Matt resisted buying a technology for his children mainly because of the cost, but his decision was also philosophically driven by his awareness of the negative aspects of consumer culture. He did not want his children to be caught up in having the latest gadgets. Matt would rather his children learn how to entertain themselves without the assistance of technology; he would rather see them spending time outside than spending time inside playing a video game. This attitude carried over into Matt's work as a teacher. While he used online discussion boards in his courses, he preferred the interaction of live, face-to-face dialogue that occurred in a physical classroom. He did not like the idea of putting his courses entirely online because he felt doing so would diminish his interactions with students. While he knew good things could come from online learning, he remained skeptical that

it would work for him. He believed that to teach in an online environment would take a tremendous amount of prep time. For Matt, these were quality of life concerns.

Patricia's life philosophy intersected with Matt's philosophy in many ways. Patricia laid out a roadmap of what a class experience might be, but left room for diversion and excursion, always wanting to make space for playing with ideas as part of the learning process. Technologies that allowed this playfulness to happen were sometimes part of her teaching. For Patricia, technology also presented many philosophical questions that required her careful attention as a parent. Patricia was very mindful about the technologies that her children used and accessed. She thought carefully about whether the technology would enhance or stunt their experience. She asked the same questions for her students. Patricia wanted her students and her children to have a kind of intellectual freedom that was unrestrained by technology. Patricia's life philosophy avoided any kind of intellectual lockdown, and this may be one reason why she was less enthusiastic about new technologies than some of her peers. She was skeptical about jumping on the bandwagon of any particular technology, and expressed concern about her institution's valuing technology more than intellectual inquiry, real learning, and authentic experience. Patricia was comfortable with questions and interested in allowing others to come to their own answers. For Patricia, too many technologies provided canned answers that were overly simplistic, which could cause a barrier to the individual learning and contemplation that took place in her class.

Bert's life philosophy was practical He opened himself up to the magic of being swept away in the mystery and beauty of technology, but was often disappointed with the technical reality. Bert's early background and undergraduate degree in computer science

had shaped his view of technology before he joined the academy. This outlook stayed with him, giving him a highly practical worldview. Bert was also guided by a physical philosophy, having a condition that limited, to some degree, his dexterity. He was conscious of this in his daily technology choices, considering whether or not a technology might be cumbersome to use. Bert was also unafraid of jumping into a technology that offered value. He was confident in his ability to make something work.

Sandra had reached a turning point in her teaching, looking at many different technologies and incorporating new things (such as the iPad) even before she fully understood how to use them. She wanted to connect with her students via technology and reinvigorate her teaching. Life philosophies changed over time, just as identities changed, and Sandra was experiencing a series of changes while this study took place

Charles resisted technologies that wanted to control or limit him. Charles wanted the individual to rise above the manipulative compulsions of technology, and to forge an identity that was ultimately human. For Charles, technology reduced one's lifeworld to a series of often meaningless exchanges. Charles wanted his teaching, his work, and his life to have meaning, and technology was something too often used to rob him of this meaning.

Impact on family

The faculty members' experience with technology, both personally and professionally, was heavily influenced by how they felt it would change or shape their relationships with family (partners, spouses, and children). This concern was linked the time factor; however, participants expressed specific concerns with how technology took them away from their responsibilities as a parent or partner. There was a sharp distinction between

faculty with young children living at home and faculty who had grown or no children. All of the Associate Professors in this study had at least two young children living with them, as well as a spouse, and these factors were perhaps the single biggest shaper of their and technology decisions. This is well represented in the literature (Churchman & King, 2009; Harvey, Novicevic, Zikic, & Ready, 2007; O'Laughlin & Bischoff, 2005; Ward, 2012); however, these studies tend to focus more on the broader academic experience and less on how or whether technology shapes that experience.

E-mail made an especially strong showing among technologies that intruded on the lives of faculty. There was a wrestling between a professor's role as a teacher/academic and that of a parent deciding whether the e-mail required immediate attention. While it could be argued that we live in a largely visual society (Domke, Perlmutter & Spratt, 2002), one must also consider the impact of sound. Mobile devices and desktop computers can make a sound indicating an e-mail's arrival. Bert disabled this sound. Some faculty did not disable the sound. If a faculty member was in the same room with the device and the sound was enabled (or was never turned off), it was distracting. This even happened during some of the interviews. Faculty members in this study spoke very specifically about the experience of the words their children spoke to them; they also went to the trouble of mimicking the sound of the voices of their children. Participants who had the sound enabled on their devices also mimicked the sound of their device when a new e-mail arrived. This sound of an arriving e-mail was a calling out to them, the voice of something to be addressed or answered. I am not suggesting that the faculty in this study put their e-mail on the same plane as their children – hey clearly wanted to put their children first, meeting their emotional and physical needs. However, they

acknowledged the difficulty of tending to their children's needs in an age of pervasive, ubiquitous technology. Patricia conveyed her concern when her daughter made a picture of her mother at the computer. She saw it as a clear association between her direct connection to and use of technology. Patricia questioned this association. She was dependent on technology to do her work, but did not want her children to think of her as being tied to her computer. Patricia frequently felt torn when working from home, because she did not want to miss important moments in the lives of her children. She also wanted to move forward in her career. Patricia stood firmly by her decision not to have a smartphone, but felt she would eventually surrender to having an e-mail enabled device. She worried how it would change her relationship with her children.

Sandra had a similar experience. Both Sandra and her husband frequently used mobile devices to communicate with people for work. Sandra mentioned that she had asked her husband to put away his mobile device during important family moments (such as having dinner). Sandra acknowledged that she also succumbed to the pull of technology when watching a movie with a daughter. Her daughter asked her to engage with a particular scene in the movie, which meant that Sandra had to first 'disengage' with her mobile device. It was challenging for Sandra to 'turn off' whatever she was working on, and because the technology made it possible for her to work on something at any time and from anywhere, the dividing lines between home time and work time were increasingly blurred. Because Sandra was perhaps more likely to use new and emerging technologies, she felt more susceptible to being seduced by them. She admitted that for many years she had a "no e-mail on the weekend" rule, but that changed once she got an iPad. She was

aware of the change and was even surprised by it, but had not felt a need to turn things off completely as a way of protecting time with her family.

Matt placed his struggle with managing his role as parent and role as professor in a slightly different context. Part of this experience was tied to his home. He and his wife lived in a three bedroom house. He and his wife had a bedroom, his two boys shared a bedroom, and his daughter had her own room. There was not a dedicated office, and so the family computer was in a high-traffic corridor of the house. This computer was used by everyone in the family, so in addition to the challenges of managing how much time he spent on the computer, Matt also managed the demands of other family members wanting to use the computer. Matt talked about the experience of being highly engaged in responding to an e-mail. His thoughts were directed towards it, and he was fully engaged with his response, hoping to express himself as best as possible. At the same time, one of his children was asking him to play a game. When Matt recounted that he asked his child to wait until he finished responding to the e-mail, and he recoiled at the guilt he felt from this response. He knew that playing with his children was a precious activity that he should treasure. Matt had difficulty resisting the e-mail in which he was engaged. At the same time, he very much wanted to be a good father to his children. This may be one reason why Matt preferred to do most of his serious work outside of the home, or in a space like a coffee shop or library. These spaces offered a way of escaping the competing demands placed upon him. These neutral spaces were guilt-free work zones.

There are several studies that look at the demands of being a professor and a parent. O'Laughlin and Bischoff (2005) found that while tenure status did not play a significant

role in parent-academic conflict, gender did, with women carrying more of the household duties than males.

Familiarity

Participants seemed to gravitate to certain technologies because they were already comfortable and confident using that technology. For example, discussion boards (a feature long available in virtually all LMS products used in higher education) were popular with most of the participants in this study. Some of the participants in the study used discussion boards when they taught as graduate students. While the participants were quick to say that the discussion boards were not an exciting or new technology, they were highly functional and useful in many classes. Participants who used discussion boards felt the boards enhanced their existing teaching style. In other words, the technology of a discussion board reinforced the Socratic ideology that most of these professors believed to be important to their work as a teacher. Another important factor was that discussion boards were familiar and had no time-consuming learning curve.

The participants in this study seemed to be constantly asking themselves questions about technology and whether or not the technology would be a good fit for their lives. They usually looked for practicality and applicability in what they used in their teaching. One recurring theme in the data was a resistance to mere consumer culture, something that many of the participants associated with technology. Whether it was seen as contributing to a landfill or influencing irresponsible spending decisions, the participants in this study did not want to participate in that kind of experience or culture. They approached this from the same negative standpoint of pressuring students to purchase things. In a sense, this could be seen as faculty members' applying their moral

sensitivities to their involvement with and acceptance of technologies, but it is also tied to a sense of the familiar, the comfortable.

The Physical and Tactile

The human experience is often deeply tied to the physical sensation of touch (Larssen, Charlesson, & Edwards, 2007). All the faculty members in this study addressed, either directly and indirectly, how their tactile experience with technology shaped their preferences and how their preferences shaped their experience. People took for granted the physical experience of touching a keyboard (Van Manen & Adams, 2009), but it was part of their experience nonetheless. Direct questions about the physical experience were never asked, yet discussion of the experience appeared over and over in the interviews. This physical experience was always present with each participant.

Bert had perhaps the most pressing physical experience because it was one of frequent discomfort. In addition, Bert had a progressing physical condition that made many devices (such as smartphones and tablets) undesirable. For all participants, there was a concern with the amount of comfort and ease technologies during work completion. Some preferred laptops, some preferred the standard desktop, and one was developing an affinity for the touch screen of an iPad. Bert's decisions about technology (and perhaps many other parts of his life) were driven to some degree by his physical limitations – of which I was unaware until he pointed them out – and by his knowledge that his condition will likely grow worse. Of the participants in this study, Bert was the one who talked the most about the physical limitations of his body in relation to technology. Looking at things through the vantage point of someone with a disability is a phenomenological approach to which the vast majority of people (including many instructional designers

and instructional technologists, as well as researchers) remain ignorant (Brune, 2013). Bert's constant, unavoidable awareness of the physical shaped his work as a professor. While there are many studies looking at how assistive technologies are used, we have few studies considering how physical limitations shape every day technology use (Lupton & Seymour, 2000).

Bert talked the most about his need to have a physical component to his creative work. He longed for something tangible, something that he could put his hand on, something that required physical space on his desk, in his hands. The work of an academic tends to be intangible (Lattuca, 2002), and in this way, the tools of technology feel intangible too. For Bert, there was a nagging dissatisfaction from only working with ideas, theories, and digital screens. The act of writing is not new to academic work, but fewer and fewer academics write using pen and paper. In fact, some participants suggested that their penmanship was in such a state that it could no longer be read. Participants in this study praised the ability to provide feedback on papers electronically (using the Comments feature in Microsoft Word for example), but this too was an example of fewer physical interactions with the work.

Bert was excited to talk about his latest creative project that involved drawing, ink, and the impending release of a final product. The work was not academic in nature, though it was closely related to his research interests. Bert talked about his need to create something real for the world, and for himself. The process was painstaking in detail, but Bert believed it strengthened his work for the university, helping him better understand something that was usually only talked about theoretically in the classes he taught. This creative project, very much physical in nature, enabled him to make connections between

his academic self and his creative self. Both were parts of his experience as a teacher, but this connection has come rather late in his professional career. His field tended to lean heavily on the creative arts, so this opportunity may have been more accessible to him than it would have been to other professors.

Sandra's sense of the physical was in transition. She still visited the library to get a physical paper-based copy of a journal to share with her students. She noted with disappointment that this no longer seemed interesting to her students, and was perhaps less interesting to her as well. She had become an avid eBook reader, preferring to read things on a digital device. Sandra even believed that reading online allowed her to read more quickly.

Charles resisted the digital nature of his work the most. He still preferred to read things from a paper-based medium. He wanted to feel the pages turning in his hands. While it is true that all the participants in this study had large libraries in their offices, Charles's library was the most extensive, with books spilling from the shelves onto the floor. Of course, his experience was not merely a desire to have physical contact with a book, but was also a rejection of digital media's infiltration into his life. He printed many e-mails, and if an extensive report was sent to him for reading (and for providing comments), he would print it.

Because so much of the work of a professor revolved around writing, much attention was paid to getting the right setup of keyboard, chair, desk, and other writing accoutrements. Even the angle of the monitor was a consideration. Van Manen said that, "to write is a solitary experience, a solitary and self-forgetful submersion in the textual reality" (2002, p. 3). It is important to remember that none of the participants in this

study taught online classes and most rejected doing so for a variety of reasons. An online class is a virtual manifestation of the most intangible kind of teaching (Charless, 2003). In fact, knowledge work itself is highly intangible (Alvesson, 2001). These untouchables and their associated phenomenological experience ask for their own study.

The academic community itself was becoming less tangible. The faculty members in the study talked about their sense of academic community and what it meant to be connected to their colleagues virtually. Because most of the participants did not feel a particularly strong sense of community within the physical confines of the university, they were able to connect with colleagues using e-mail and the Internet. Sandra would have liked to feel a more immediate sense of community within her department, particularly in regards to her day-to-day interactions. While she frequently felt as though she was working in isolation, she was able to connect with others around the world who were interested in her work. Patricia had a similar experience. Even Charles acknowledged that the Internet had made his work accessible to more people. Matt felt a strong sense of community in the network of blogs that he frequently read, but did not mention very much about the sense of community he might have felt with his department at the university. All the faculty members touched on the experience of working from home. While they liked this experience overall, they also said that to work from home was to work in an isolated space. That is why all of them came to campus (to varying degrees) to do certain kinds of work besides teaching – just to have some degree of connection to the physical space of their office, the campus, and the structure of the university.

The Internet Experience

Participants used the Internet for job related duties (research, evaluations), and more practical and personal matters (paying bills and corresponding with friends and family); however, whether the Internet was seen as a positive force for the academy was still a highly contested issue. Jones and Jones (2005) found that younger faculty were less likely than their older peers to believe that the Internet helped them to learn the names of their students or that it was a positive force in their teaching. My own research did not find this kind of seemingly clear dividing line between faculty of varying ages.

Bert's felt that the Internet had largely eliminated one formerly important part of his job as a teacher, that of *The Introducer*. When Bert was growing up in the rural southeastern United States, the Internet did not exist. Bert did not have access to the media and culture of the world except through his local Public Broadcasting TV station. When Bert first started teaching, he spent a large portion of class time just showing students various pieces of media because doing so was the only way to get the media to his students. With the Internet, and specifically with tools like YouTube, introducing students to film and media during class was no longer necessary; the students had access to the content long before arriving in his classroom. For Bert, this was not a jarring change in his experience as a teacher, but was instead an opportunity to start using his classroom time differently. Once the students had easy access to content outside of class, it was possible for him to delve deeper into various theories and subjects. Things that wouldn't have been possible before seemed obtainable now. When he was growing up, Bert hungered for ways of connecting with the larger world of media and participating in conversations about ideas. He was happy for his students, but believed they may not

appreciate everything that was available. While some students arrived to class knowing nothing about a particular topic, Bert believed those students were becoming increasingly rare.

This experience of change emerged with the other participants, though perhaps less dramatically. For the most part, the subjects taught by the other professors did not lend themselves quite as well to Internet; still, all the professors addressed the opening of the world to their students. Charles touched on accepting the fact that his students may well be shopping for shoes in the middle of class. While he did react harshly against sounds emitted from student devices during class, he did not attempt to control or limit what or when they accessed them. Bert seemed to embrace technologies, even referring to the technological world as 'the world' for his students, while Charles worked towards having his students challenge what they saw in their devices. One approach was not necessarily better than the other, but they both highlighted how technology shaped who they were as teachers.

In this study, I placed e-mail under the broader category of the Internet partly because e-mail was such a frequent topic of conversation in the interviews. We live in a time when e-mail, like the Internet, is virtually always available. For participants, the Internet and e-mail were closely aligned. For the faculty members in this study, e-mail was a constant flow of communication data. Interestingly, the faculty members had little mental mechanisms for managing this flow. Some had windows of time each day in which they would check and respond to e-mail. Others put an hourly limit for checking email per day, though it was not restricted to a particular time. Patricia simply did not read or respond to e-mails that she felt were unimportant. While the ways in which they managed

the e-mail varied, there was a theme of making sure that e-mail did not manage their day-to-day work. All seemed to acknowledge that if they did not put tight controls on how to work through e-mail, they would probably spend much more time with e-mail.

E-mail was perhaps the ultimate example of the Janus-faced nature of technology. On one hand, faculty members saw e-mail as a powerful communication tool that allowed them to exchange ideas and information with their colleagues at other universities. It allowed them to participate in rich conversations that might not otherwise happen. E-mail also made it possible for more and more people to contact the faculty about a variety of topics. This avalanche of e-mail would be overwhelming to anyone, but the faculty in this study seemed to have no qualms about assigning importance (or unimportance) to arriving e-mails. In fact, perhaps their ability to do this contributed to their success in the academy.

E-mail also gave faculty members a way to quickly provide students with feedback on writing assignments. This too was a double-edged sword, in that faculty members no longer had an excuse for not getting feedback to students in a timely manner. Bert mentioned that digital communication tools forced him to be more responsive to his students. While this was ultimately a good thing for all participants, it made their job faster and more challenging. For Sandra, having her students submit their work electronically was a slightly different experience. It was 'out of sight, out of mind.' By not having the paper-based copies of their papers with her, she was not reminded that those papers needed to be graded. Because Sandra had recently adopted the iPad, the ease of access to her e-mail (and therefore to the writing assignments of her students) might do away with that feeling.

The immediacy of the Internet and e-mail also caused participants to spend more time reflecting on their e-mail, posts, and other digital responses. Bert in particular talked about how alarmed he was at how vehement and vicious so many digital exchanges could be. Bert believed that these exchanges revealed the underbelly of our digital communication mediums, and it was part of the job of an academic to thoughtfully reflect on something before responding.

With the exception of Charles, the faculty in this study seemed unconcerned about their privacy. Most had flexible ideas about how much Internet connection with their students was acceptable. It was clear that they were all in a state of change as they navigated the Internet professionally and personally. Even Charles seemed undaunted when I asked him whether it would upset him if a student recorded his lecture and posted it on the Internet. He seemed to suggest that it was something that probably happened and that he could do nothing to control or prevent it. He also knew that such incidents were becoming quite common ("Salem students secretly recorded teachers," n.d.). While he would prefer that students asked for permission to record a lecture, the real change was that people seemed to think it was okay to record whenever and wherever they wanted.

The Gender Experience

Gender was a strong line of demarcation that further divided the experience of participants in this study and that is why I have created a special section for it here. Gender remained a powerful force that frequently worked against tenured female faculty, and this experience is well documented in the literature (August & Waltman, 2004; Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; Gibson, 2004; Sullivan, Riger, Raja, & Stokes, 1997).

The two female participants noted that their experience in the academy had been largely shaped by being female and by being a mother.

Sandra conveyed a story about a conversation she had with the chair of her department in his office one day. The chair told Sandra that since she was a new mother, he was going to pass a particular project along to someone else, because he presumed that Sandra would no longer have time to do it. When Sandra conveyed the story, she spoke of how the experience did not at first register with her as something of concern. It just seemed that the chair was doing her a kindness by keeping some work off of her plate. But within days, she started to realize that she was denied the opportunity to do the work and participate in the project because she was female. She felt that if she were male and a new father, the conversation with the chair would never have happened, and the project would have been hers. In addition, Sandra felt that faculty in her department who were not parents were often given more freedom and more attention than faculty who had children. Sandra felt this was especially true for women. When Sandra talked about this experience, she said she believed that it could result in the non-parent faculty getting more published, and getting more recognition in the department. Sandra had to sometimes work hard at not feeling as though she had been singled out and at not holding that feeling against her colleagues. When Sandra talked about those feelings, it was almost as though she felt some guilt. She did not want to feel that way, nor wanted those feelings to be a part of her experience in the academy. Yet they were there, an ever-present part of professional life.

Patricia spoke in a more general sense about her experience as a female in her own department. She definitely felt that even though the timing of when she had children had

worked reasonably well for her career, motherhood was still something that her male (and some female) colleagues held against her. Patricia believed this was not a conscious practice but rather something that happened unconsciously, based on practices of assumption, history, and practice.

Neither of these participants had regrets about having children, but these experiences showed that the academy had a long way to go before gender equality became a reality. While Matt talked about his experience as a parent, and how that experience had affected his professional identity, he never suggested that being a father (or, for that matter, being male) had a negative impact on his career. He never suggested that his colleagues held him to a lower standard because he had decided to be a father. He never talked about being denied a project because he had children. My two female participants seemed to experience a system in which they were being punished (to varying degrees) for choosing to be both a parent and an academic – as though the two roles were simply not meant to coexist, at least not for women. This experience had been a huge factor in their work satisfaction, and had perhaps been the single most important factor in their lives as scholars and teachers. The literature is rich with studies that have explored this topic (Ward, 2012), but extensive discussion of this phenomenon is beyond the focus on my study.

Crossing the Finish Line: Tenure, Teaching, and Technology

This section answers the second research question, considering how other factors shaped the experience of these faculty members. The process of getting tenure was a definitive experience for the faculty in this study. Even participants who did not talk at length about getting tenure would frequently reference tenure as an important part of the

professor experience, with or without the involvement of technology. This uncovering may in part be attributed to the selection criteria of the study. Because all participants had already experienced tenure and all were involved to varying degrees with tenure granting committees, the tenure process was undeniably a large part of their experience in the academy, an experience that to varying degrees shaped most other experiences in their profession. The faculty in this study suggested that trying to do something innovative with technology before getting tenure was unlikely, unless a professor were given a directive to do something specific with the technology from a dean or department chair. That did not mean that untenured professors totally resisted technology; it simply meant that they were extremely risk-averse and did not want to waste time on activities that did not contribute to the bottom line of tenure. For the faculty in this study, such decisions were really about time management rather than any resistance to technology. Because so many demands were made on professors' time, they had to develop the ability to say no to things that did not contribute to tenure. All the participants in this study were comfortable with saying no to various things. Without the power of 'no,' they seemed to believe that it would not have been possible to get tenure.

The interview data also suggested that this approach to time management could change once tenure was achieved. Once a professor got tenure, a different set of priorities sometimes changed the landscape of what he/she wanted to do with technology, both professionally and personally. For example, Sandra was engaging with technology to reinvigorate her teaching practice once she got tenure. Overall, the professors in this study were less likely to set up, use, or communicate through social media outlets until tenure was established.

Even after tenure was achieved, the faculty in this study retained a high awareness of the limitations of their free time. There was a constant battle over where their time (both for work and for pleasure) was to be allocated. The most common attitude towards technology from these participants was that technology often robbed them of valuable time, time that should have been spent on more productive things.

So, tenure and the process of achieving it influenced when and if technologies were used in teaching and in one's personal life. In addition, tenure shaped the faculty experience of these participants much more than technology. There was a strong dividing line between being an Associate Professor and being a Full Professor. Attitudes, responses, and concerns were quite different in this study depending on where one was in his or her career path. For Associate Professors who wished to rise to the rank of Full Professor, there was strong pressure to remain focused on those activities tied to becoming Full Professor. Incorporating technology into one's teaching was not something that helped.

In this study, Full Professors were more comfortable answering questions about the academy and their experience with tenure. They showed less concern about someone discovering their identity in the study, and felt more comfortable in speaking about their experience, even if that meant saying something negative about their department or the university in general. Associate Professors were more cautious. Associate Professors would often want confirmation that our conversations were confidential, or would jokingly ask what I would do to protect their identity. While some of these comments and asides seemed light-hearted on the surface, there was an underlying tension amongst Associate Professors, the kind of tension that seemed to rise from having not quite

arrived at the place they wanted. While the Associate Professors were focused (to varying degrees) on becoming a Full Professor, they knew there was no guarantee and perhaps felt that they might make some small misstep in our interviews with some offhand comment that would later haunt them. These interactions showed that professor status played a role in the lived experience of these participants. Even after tenure was achieved, there was another level to strive for, and reaching that level had little or nothing to do with technology.

IDT professionals need to consider where a professor is on her or his path in the institution and consider whether or not teaching is even an important part of her or his professional life. For these five participants, teaching was important, but tenure-track faculty juggle a variety of professional responsibilities and where those responsibilities fall in the spectrum of importance will vary. For the tenured professors in this study, technology in the classroom was something outside the realm of their day-to-day concerns. Because they had been teaching for more than a decade, they were likely to have a fairly well-developed way of teaching. IDT professionals are unlikely to change this unless the professor seeks them out directly for feedback and guidance, and even then, there would be many limitations. Perhaps it is time for IDT professionals to consider more closely what *should* be done, which may be very little or nothing.

Participants in this study sought little teaching guidance from anyone at the university other than peers in their departments, and only one sought out technology integration assistance from IDT professionals. Technology integration was simply not on the radar. Technology simply did not register as a priority for these participants.

IDT professionals may find this to be disheartening. Does this mean that tenured faculty at research institutions are simply off limits to us? The answer is yes and no. It is true that many tenured faculty members will never have an interest in sitting down with us to discuss teaching and technology. There may even be some faculty members who respond unpleasantly when we suggest some new technology to improve or enhance in their teaching. We should not internalize this.

Suggestions for Future Studies

This report did not delve deeply into how teacher professionalism was defined by the participants. Such a definition is hotly contested (Goodson, 2002) and worthy of a study unto itself, particularly in this time of rapid change in higher education. Because this study was limited to a small group of tenured faculty, there are severe limitations on how their experience can be generalized to the larger population of faculty in North America. To counter this, it might be useful to do a study in the future where large numbers of tenured faculty participate via survey. This would, of course, be a very different set of data in size, scope, and type; however, it would reveal how the experiences of these five faculty compare to a much larger (and non-university specific) group.

Future studies might focus on non-tenure track professors and their experience with technology in their personal and professional lifeworlds. Because non-tenured faculty may have a very different set of concerns and priorities, their experience with technology might be different from tenure track professors. In addition, it might be useful to compare groups of faculty by college, subject, and institution. For example, it might be useful to compare data between research institutions and teaching institutions. Though such a study might be somewhat controversial, it would be interesting to compare the

experiences between new faculty (those who have only been teaching in higher education for five years or fewer) with those who have been teaching for more than 15 years. This might reveal not only how much faculty members' use and expectations of technology have changed, but also whether the institutions have changed.

Suggestions for IDT Professionals who Work with Tenured Faculty

IDT Professionals who work in higher education settings may benefit from some of the findings of this study. I have included a series of questions that IDT workers can use to prepare themselves for working with tenured faculty. The questions should not be used to stereotype faculty. In fact, I do not suggest that answers to these questions be shared with the faculty members. Instead, IDT professionals' responses (which should come about through reflective writing) should be a catalyst to engender deeper thought about what the expectations, needs, and experience of the faculty might be. These questions should be the basis for an IDT worker reflection form, from which a plan of how to best work with an individual faculty member can be developed. The questions might help one slow down and think deeply about how to approach a professor and to consider his/her lived experience.

There are three sets of questions. The first set is appropriate to use before the IDT professional's first meeting with the professor. The second set could be used during the professional's meeting with the faculty member. The third set is best to use after the initial meeting. The IDT worker should add his/her own unique questions based on the context and situation.

Before (Set 1):

- What assumptions do I have about this teacher?

- What do I think I know about this teacher?
- What is this based on?
- What seems important to this teacher?
- What kinds of technology does he/she currently use professionally? Personally?
- What kind of teaching experience/knowledge does he/she already have?

During (Set 2)

- What kind of experience do you want your students to have in this class?
- What are the most important things you want your students to learn in this class?
- What are some of the things you most enjoy doing in your class?

After (Set 3)

- What teaching methods do they seem to be most interested in?
- What can you offer them that will improve their teaching?
- What is she or he doing that could be done differently to save time?
- Where do they spend most of their time when teaching?
- What is their least favorite task to do as a professor?

Closing Remarks

This study set out to uncover the lived experience of tenured faculty. By examining how these faculty members experienced technology, teaching and tenure, a complex picture of resistance and incorporation emerged. Phenomenological methods were used to guide the project and capture the unique experience of each individual. Results were provided with modest suggestions for IDT Professionals. Perhaps the biggest change in this study has been that of the researcher. My experience with collecting data, analyzing data, and writing up the results has been enriching personally and professionally.

References

Adams, C. (2010). iCyborg: Shifting out of neutral and the pedagogical road ahead. In *Looking Toward the Future of Technology Enhanced Education: Ubiquitous Learning and the Digital Native*. IGI Global. Retrieved from http://www.secondaryed.ualberta.ca/People/AcademicStaff/CatherineAdams.aspx

Adams, K. (2002). *What colleges and universtities want in new faculty*. Association of American Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from www.aacu.org/pff/pdfs/PFF_Adams.PDF

Albright, M. J. (1996). Instructional technology and higher education: Rewards, rights, and responsibilities. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED392412

Allen, I. E., Seaman, J., & Babson Survey Research Group. (2012). *Digital faculty: Professors, teaching and technology, 2012*. Babson Survey Research Group.

Alvesson, M. (2001). Knowledge work: Ambiguity, image and identity. *Human Relations*, *54*(7), 863–886. doi:10.1177/0018726701547004

Applebaum, M. (2012). Phenomenological psychological research as science. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, *43*(1), 36–72. doi:10.1163/156916212X632952

Arnold, M. (2003). On the phenomenology of technology: The "Janus-faces" of mobile phones. *Information and Organization*, *13*(4), 231–256. doi:10.1016/S1471-7727(03)00013-7

August, L., & Waltman, J. (2004). Culture, climate, and contribution: Career satisfaction among female faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, *45*(2), 177–192. doi:10.1023/B:RIHE.0000015694.14358.ed

Ayers, E. L. (2004). The academic culture & the IT culture: Their effect on teaching and scholarship. *EDUCAUSE Review*, *39*(6), 48.

Baillie, L. (1996). A phenomenological study of the nature of empathy. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *24*(6), 1300–1308. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.1996.tb01038.x

Bain, J. D., & McNaught, C. (2006). How academics use technology in teaching and learning: understanding the relationship between beliefs and practice. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *22*(2), 99–113. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2729.2006.00163.x

Bakewell, S. (2011). *How to live, or, A life of Montaigne in one question and twenty attempts at an answer*. New York: Other Press.

Baldwin, R. G. (1998). Technology's impact on faculty life and work. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *1998*(76), 7–21. doi:10.1002/tl.7601

Barker, C. (2011). *Cultural studies: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage Publications Ltd.

Bates, A. W., & Poole, G. (2003). *Effective teaching with technology in higher education: Foundations for success*. Jossey-Bass, An Imprint of Wiley. 10475 Crosspoint Blvd, Indianapolis, IN 46256. Tel: 877-762-2974; Fax: 800-597-3299; e-mail: consumers@wiley.com; Web site: http://www.josseybass.com. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED498562

Bazeley, D. P. (2007). *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications Ltd.

Becker, C. S. (1992). *Living and relating: An introduction to phenomenology*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Billot, J. (2010). The imagined and the real: identifying the tensions for academic identity. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *29*(6), 709–721. doi:10.1080/07294360.2010.487201

Binswanger, L. (1975). *Being-in-the-world: Selected papers of Ludwig Binswanger*. (J. Needleman, Ed. & Trans.). Condor.

Block, W. (2004). The "Digital Divide" is not a problem in need of rectifying. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *53*(4), 393–406.

Bolton, N. (1987). Beyond method□: Phenomenology as an approach to consciousness. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, *18*(1), 49–58.

Bourdieu, P. (1987). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Harvard University Press.

Boyles, D. (2011). The privatized public: Antagonism for a radical democratic politics in schools? *Educational Theory*, *61*(4), 433–450. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5446.2011.00413.x

Bronstein, P., & Farnsworth, L. (1998). Gender differences in faculty experiences of interpersonal climate and processes for advancement. *Research in Higher Education*, *39*(5), 557–585. doi:10.1023/A:1018701722855

Brown, C. S., & Toadvine, T. (Eds.). (2003). *Eco-Phenomenology: Back to the Earth itself*. State University of New York Press.

Bruder, K. A., & Ucok, O. (2000). Interactive art interpretation: How viewers make sense of paintings in conversation. *Symbolic Interaction*, *23*(4), 337–358. doi:10.1525/si.2000.23.4.337

Brune, J. A., & Wilson. (2013). *Disability and passing: Blurring the lines of identity*.

Bruner, J. S. (1959). Myth and identity. *Daedalus*, *88*(2), 349–358.

Bullock, C., & Ory, J. (2000). Evaluating instructional technology implementation in a higher education environment. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *21*(3), 315–328. doi:10.1177/109821400002100303

Burdman, P. (2005). The student debt dilemma: Debt aversion as a barrier to college access. Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/6sp9787j

Burniske, R. W. (2001). *Breaking down the digital walls: Learning to teach in a post-modem world*. State University of New York Press.

Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Butler, D. L., & Sellbom, M. (2002). Barriers to adopting technology for teaching and learning. *Educause Quarterly*, *25*(2), 22–28.

Carroll, M. T., & Tafoya, E. (2000). *Phenomenological approaches to popular culture*. Popular Press.

Cashman, C. S., & McCraw, P. (1993). *Conducting qualitative research in instructional technology: Methods and techniques*.

Chizmar, J. F., & Williams, D. B. (2001). What do faculty want? *Educause Quarterly*, *24*(1), 18–24.

Christensen, C., Johnson, C. W., & Horn, M. B. (2008). *Disrupting class: How disruptive innovation will change the way the world learns* (1st ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Churchman, D., & King, S. (2009). Academic practice in transition: Hidden stories of academic Identities. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *14*(5), 507–516.

Cilesiz, S. (2009). Educational computer use in leisure contexts: A phenomenological study of adolescents' experiences at internet cafés. *American Educational Research Journal*, *46*(1), 232–274. doi:10.3102/0002831208323938

Cilesiz, S. (2011). A phenomenological approach to experiences with technology: current state, promise, and future directions for research. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *59*(4), 487–510. doi:10.1007/s11423-010-9173-2

Compaine, B. M. (2001). *The digital divide: Facing a crisis or creating a myth?* MIT Press.

Cotten, S., & Wilson, B. (2006). Student–faculty interactions: Dynamics and determinants. *Higher Education*, *51*(4), 487–519. doi:10.1007/s10734-004-1705-4

Cox, B., McIntosh, K., Terenzini, P., Reason, R., & Lutovsky Quaye, B. (2010). Pedagogical signals of faculty approachability: Factors shaping faculty-student interaction outside the classroom. *Research in Higher Education*, *51*(8), 767–788. doi:10.1007/s11162-010-9178-z

Crabtree, B. F., & Miller, W. L. (1999). *Doing qualitative research*. SAGE.

Crawford, M. B. (2010). *Shop class as soulcraft: An inquiry into the value of work* (Reprint.). Penguin (Non-Classics).

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *theory into practice*, *39*(3), 124–130. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip3903_2

Crick, T. P. (2010). The game body: Toward a phenomenology of contemporary video gaming. *Games and Culture*. doi:10.1177/1555412010364980

Crotty, M. J. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Sage Publications Ltd.

Davis, J. E. (2000). *Identity and social change*. Transaction Publishers.

Dempsey, S. E. (2009). The increasing technology divide. *Feminist Media Studies*, *9*(1), 37–55. doi:10.1080/14680770802619482

Denardo, A. M., & D, E. (n.d.). Using NVivo to analyze qualitative data. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.83.5090

Denzin, N. K. (2007a). *On understanding emotion*. Transaction Publishers.

Denzin, N. K. (2007b). *Symbolic interactionism and cultural studies: The politics of interpretation* (1st ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2007). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Dewey, J. (2005). *Art as experience*. Perigee Trade.

Dexter, S., & Riedel, E. (2003). Why improving preservice teacher educational technology preparation must go beyond the college's walls. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *54*(4), 334–346. doi:10.1177/0022487103255319

Domke, D., Perlmutter, D., & Spratt, M. (2002). The primes of our times? An examination of the "power" of visual images. *Journalism*, *3*(2), 131–159. doi:10.1177/146488490200300211

Dornan, T., Scherpbier, A., King, N., & Boshuizen, H. (2005). Clinical teachers and problem-based learning: a phenomenological study. *Medical Education*, *39*(2), 163–170. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2929.2004.01914.x

Douglas, J. D. (1976). *Investigative social research: Individual and team field research*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Doyle, L., & Silverman, K. (Eds.). (2001). *Bodies of resistance: New phenomenologies of politics, agency, and culture* (1st ed.). Northwestern University Press.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Wrathall, M. A. (2009). *A companion to phenomenology and existentialism*. John Wiley & Sons.

Duncombe, J., & Jessop, J. (2002). *"Doing rapport" and the ethics of "faking friendship."* Sage.

Eisner, E. W. (2004). *The Arts and the creation of mind*. Yale University Press.

Electronic elsewheres: Media, technology, and the experience of social space. (2010). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Englander, M. (2012). The interview: Data collection in descriptive phenomenological human scientific research*. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, *43*(1), 13–35. doi:10.1163/156916212X632943

Fällman, D. (2003). *In romance with the materials of mobile interaction□: A phenomenological approach to the design of mobile information technology* (dissertation). Umeå University. Retrieved from http://umu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:141855

Flowerday, T., & Schraw, G. (2000). Teacher beliefs about instructional choice: A phenomenological study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *92*(4), 634–45.

Foote, C. (2012). Learning together: The evolution of a 1:1 iPad program. *Internet@Schools*, *19*(1), 14.

Friberg, F., Claesson, S., Berndtsson, I., & Öhlén, J. (2007). Issues about thinking phenomenologically while doing phenomenology. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, *38*(2), 256–277.

Frohberg, D., Göth, C., & Schwabe, G. (2009). Mobile learning projects –A critical analysis of the state of the art. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *25*(4), 307–331. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2729.2009.00315.x

Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and method* (2 Revised.). Continuum.

Gergen, K. (2001). *Social construction in context* (1st ed.). Sage Publications Ltd.

Gibson, S. K. (2004). Being mentored: The experience of women faculty. *Journal of Career Development*, *30*(3), 173–188. doi:10.1023/B:JOCD.0000015538.41144.2b

Giorgi, A. (1992). Description versus interpretation: Competing alternative strategies for qualitative research. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, *23*(2), 119–135. doi:10.1163/156916292X00090

Giorgi, A. (1997). The theory, practice, and evaluation of the phenomenological method as a qualitative research. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, *28*(2), 235.

Giorgi, A. (2009). *The Descriptive Phenomenological Method in Psychology: A Modified Huessrlian Approach*. Duquesne Univ Pr.

Given, L. M. (2008). *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. SAGE.

Gmelch, W. H. (1993). *Coping with faculty stress*. SAGE.

Goodman, P. (1971). *Compulsory mis-education and the community of scholars.* New York.

Goodson, I. F. (2002). *Teachers' professional lives*. Routledge.

Graham, C., Culatta, R., Pratt, M., & West, R. (2004). Redesigning the teacher Education technology course to emphasize integration. *Computers in the Schools*, *21*(1-2), 127–148. doi:10.1300/J025v21n01_10

Grbich, C. (2007). *Qualitative data analysis: An introduction*. Sage Publications Ltd.

Groves, M. M., & Zemel, P. C. (2000). Instructional technology adoption in higher education: An action research case study. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, *27*(1), 57–65.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. Continuum.

Harman, G. (2007). *Heidegger explained: From phenomenon to thing*. Open Court.

Harper, K. C., Chen, K., & Yen, D. C. (2004). Distance learning, virtual classrooms, and teaching pedagogy in the Internet environment. *Technology in Society*, *26*(4), 585–598. doi:10.1016/j.techsoc.2004.08.002

Harvey, M., Novicevic, M. M., Zikic, J., & Ready, K. (2007). How to manage multiple faculty identifications during change. *Multicultural Education & Technology Journal*, *1*(4), 259–270. doi:10.1108/17504970710832844

Heidegger, M. (2008). *Basic writings*. Harper Perennial Modern Classics.

Heidegger, M. (2010). *Being and time*. (J. Stambaugh, Trans.) (Revised.). State Univ of New York Pr.

Hembrooke, H., & Gay, G. (2003). The laptop and the lecture: The effects of multitasking in learning environments. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, *15*(1), 46–64. doi:10.1007/BF02940852

Hewitt, A., & Forte, A. (2006). Crossing boundaries: Identity management and student/faculty relationships on the Facebook. *Poster/Extended Abstract, CSCW 2006*. Retrieved from http://www-static.cc.gatech.edu/~aforte/HewittForteCSCWPoster2006.pdf

Hixon, E., Buckenmeyer, J., Barczyk, C., Feldman, L., & Zamojski, H. (2012). Beyond the early adopters of online instruction: Motivating the reluctant majority. *Internet and Higher Education*, *15*(2), 102–107.

Hoffman, M. E., & Vance, D. R. (2005). Computer literacy: What students know and from whom they learned it. *SIGCSE Bull.*, *37*(1), 356–360. doi:10.1145/1047124.1047467

Holton, S. A., & Phillips, G. (1995). Can't live with them, can't live without them: Faculty and administrators in conflict. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *1995*(92), 43–50. doi:10.1002/he.36919959208

hooks, bell. (1994). *Teaching To Transgress* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Howard, D. C. P. (1994). Human-computer interactions: A phenomenological examination of the adult first-time computer experience. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *7*(1), 33–49. doi:10.1080/0951839940070103

Hultgren, F. H. (1995). The phenomenology of "doing" phenomenology: The experience of teaching and learning together. *Human Studies*, *18*(4), 371–388. doi:10.1007/BF01318618

Husserl, E. (1970). *The crisis of European sciences and transcendental phenomenology: An introduction to phenomenological philosophy*. (D. Carr, Trans.). Northwestern University Press.

Husserl, E. (1975). *Experience and judgment*. (J. S. Churchill & K. Ameriks, Trans.) (1st ed.). Northwestern University Press.

Husserl, E. (1983). *Ideas pertaining to a pure phenomenology and to a phenomenological philosophy: First book: General introduction to a pure phenomenology*. (F. Kersten, Trans.) (1st ed.). Springer.

Husserl, E. (2001). *Logical investigations, Vol. 1*. (D. Moran, Ed.) (New edition.). Routledge.

Husserl, E. (2012). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Introna, L. (2011). Phenomenological approaches to ethics and information technology. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Summer 2011.). Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2011/entries/ethics-it-phenomenology/

Inwood, M. (2002). *Heidegger: A very short introduction* (New edition.). Oxford University Press.

Jackowski, M. B., & Akroyd, D. (2010). Technology usage among community college faculty. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, *34*(8), 624–644. doi:10.1080/10668920701831530

Jacobs, J. A. (2004). Presidential address: The faculty time divide. *Sociological Forum*, *19*(1), 3–27. doi:10.1023/B:SOFO.0000019646.82538.cc

Jacobsen, D. M. (1998). Adoption patterns of faculty who integrate computer technology for teaching and learning in higher education. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED428675

Janesick, V. J. (1994). The dance of qualitative research design: Metaphor, methodolatry, and meaning.

Johnston, L. (2006). Software and Method: Reflections on Teaching and Using QSR - NVivo in Doctoral Research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *9*(5), 379. doi:10.1080/13645570600659433

Jonassen, D. (1984). The mediation of experience and educational technology: A philosophical analysis. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *32*(3), 153–167. doi:10.1007/BF02768832

Jones, S., & Jones, C. (2005). Professors online: The Internet's impact on college faculty. *First Monday*, *10*(9). doi:10.5210/fm.v10i9.1275

Joosten, T. (2012). *Social media for educators: strategies and best practices* (First edition.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Josselson, R., & Harway, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Navigating multiple identities: Race, gender, culture, nationality, and roles* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press, USA.

Kaufmann, J. (2011). Poststructural analysis: Analyzing empirical matter for new meanings. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *17*(2), 148–154. doi:10.1177/1077800410392336

Keengwe, J., Kidd, T., & Kyei-Blankson, L. (2009). Faculty and technology: implications for faculty training and technology leadership. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, *18*(1), 23–28. doi:10.1007/s10956-008-9126-2

Kenyon, E., & Hawker, S. (1999). “Once would be enough”: Some reflections on the issue of safety for lone researchers. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *2*(4), 313–327. doi:10.1080/136455799294989

Klugman, D. (1997). Existentialism and constructivism: A bi-polar model of subjectivity. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *25*(3), 297–313. doi:10.1023/A:1025734528329

Knowles, C. (2006). Handling your baggage in the field reflections on research relationships 1. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *9*(5), 393–404. doi:10.1080/13645570601076819

Koch, P. (1994). *Solitude: A philosophical encounter*. Chicago, Ill.: Open Court.

Kozel, S. (2008). *Closer: Performance, technologies, phenomenology*. The MIT Press.

Kukulska-Hulme, A., & Traxler, J. (2005). *Mobile learning: A handbook for educators and trainers* (New edition.). Routledge.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2008). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Laing, R. D. (1991). *Self and others*. Penguin (Non-Classics).

Lanier, J. (2010). *You are not a gadget: A manifesto* (1st ed.). Knopf.

Large. (2008). *Heidegger’s being and time*. Indiana University Press.

Larssen, A. T., Robertson, T., & Edwards, J. (2007). The feel dimension of technology interaction: Exploring tangibles through movement and touch. In *Proceedings of the 1st international conference on Tangible and embedded interaction* (pp. 271–278). New York, NY, USA: ACM. doi:10.1145/1226969.1227024

Lattuca, L. R. (2002). Learning interdisciplinarity: Sociocultural perspectives on academic work. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(6), 711–739. doi:10.1353/jhe.2002.0054

Lawler, S. (2008). *Identity: Sociological perspectives* (1st ed.). Polity.

Lawrence, B., & Lentle-Keenan, S. (2013). Teaching beliefs and practice, institutional context, and the uptake of Web-based technology. *Distance Education*, *34*(1), 4–20. doi:10.1080/01587919.2013.770432

Lawrence, J. H., & Blackburn, R. T. (1985). Faculty careers: Maturation, demographic, and historical effects. *Research in Higher Education*, *22*(2), 135–154. doi:10.1007/BF00974911

Lei, J. (2010). Quantity versus quality: A new approach to examine the relationship between technology use and student outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *41*(3), 455–472. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.00961.x

Levine, R. V. (1998). *A geography of time: On tempo, culture, and the pace of life* (1st ed.). Basic Books.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry* (1st ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W. (Wyrick), & Silverman, S. J. (2007). *Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals* (5th ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Lupton, D., & Seymour, W. (2000). Technology, selfhood and physical disability. *Social Science & Medicine*, *50*(12), 1851–1862. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(99)00422-0

Lyotard, J.F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (1st ed.). Univ of Minnesota Press.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1991). *Phenomenology (Suny series in contemporary continental philosophy)*. State University of New York Press.

Macann, C. (1993). *Four phenomenological philosophers: Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty*. Routledge.

Manen, M. V. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy* (2nd ed.). State University of New York Press.

Manen, M. van. (2010). The pedagogy of Momus Technologies: Facebook, privacy, and online intimacy. *Qualitative Health Research*, *20*(8), 1023–1032. doi:10.1177/1049732310364990

Manuguerra, M., & Petocz, P. (2011). Promoting student engagement by integrating new technology into tertiary education: The role of the iPad. *Asian Social Science*, *7*(11), 61–65. doi:10.5539/ass.v7n11p61

Martin, R. E. (2011). *The college cost disease: Higher cost and lower quality*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Maynes, M. J., Pierce, J. L., & Laslett, B. (2008). *Telling stories: The use of personal narratives in the social sciences and history*. Cornell University Press.

McCarthy, J. J., & Wright, P. (2007). *Technology as experience*. The MIT Press.

McKee, C. W., & Tew, W. M. (2013). Setting the stage for teaching and learning in American higher education: Making the case for faculty development. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2013*(133), 3–14. doi:10.1002/tl.20041

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1969). *The visible and the invisible*. (A. Lingis, Trans.) (1st ed.). Northwestern University Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1973). *The prose of the world*. (J. O'Neill, Trans., C. Lefort, Ed.) (1st ed.). Northwestern University Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2002). *Phenomenology of perception* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Merriam, S. B. (2009a). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2009b). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (Rev Exp.). Jossey-Bass.

Miller, C., Veletsianos, G., & Doering, A. (2008). Curriculum at forty below: A Phenomenological inquiry of an educator/explorer's experience with adventure learning in the Arctic. *Distance Education*, *29*(3), 253–267.

Mitchell, W. (2008, December 31). I'm okay, you're okay?: Reflections on the well-being and ethical requirements of researchers and research participants in conducting qualitative fieldwork interviews. Text.Serial.Journal. Retrieved April 19, 2010, from http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/IJQM/article/viewArticle/4053

Montgomery, A., Barber, C., & McKee, P. (2002). A phenomenological study of wisdom in later life. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, *54*(2), 139–157.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods* (1st ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Natanson, M. (1974). *Edmund Husserl: Philosopher of infinite tasks* (1st ed.). Northwestern University Press.

O'Laughlin, E. M., & Bischoff, L. G. (2005). Balancing parenthood and academia work/family stress as influenced by gender and tenure status. *Journal of Family Issues*, *26*(1), 79–106. doi:10.1177/0192513X04265942

Oppenheimer, T. (2003). *The flickering mind: The false promise of technology in the classroom and how learning can be saved* (1st ed.). Random House.

Ortlipp, M. (2008). Keeping and using reflective journals in the qualitative research process. *Qualitative Report*, *13*(4), 695–705.

Owen, R. (1995). Social constructionism and the theory, practice and research of psychotherapy: A phenomenological psychology manifesto., (46), 161–186.

Padgett, D. K. (2003). *The qualitative research experience, Revised printing* (1st ed.). Brooks Cole.

Palmer, P. J. (1999). *Let your life speak: Listening for the voice of vocation* (1st ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Park, C.-H., & Kim, Y.-G. (2003). Identifying key factors affecting consumer purchase behavior in an online shopping context. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, *31*(1), 16–29. doi:10.1108/09590550310457818

Parker, K., Lenhart, A., Moore, K., & Pew Internet & American Life Project. (2011). *The digital revolution and higher education: College presidents, public differ on value of online learning*. Pew Internet & American Life Project.

Parry, J. D. (Ed.). (2011). *Art and phenomenology* (1st ed.). Routledge.

Paul, A. M. (2012, September 14). How computerized tutors are learning to teach humans. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/16/magazine/how-computerized-tutors-are-learning-to-teach-humans.html

Polkinghorne, D. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. SUNY Press.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1989). Phenomenological research methods. In R. S. Valle & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological perspectives in psychology: Exploring the breadth of human experience* (pp. 41–60). New York, NY, US: Plenum Press.

Postman, N. (1993). *Technopoly: The surrender of culture to technology* (1st ed.). Vintage.

Postman, N. (1996). *The end of education: Redefining the value of school* (First Edition.). Vintage.

PR Newswire. (2011, October 6). Abilene Christian University Releases 2010-11 Mobile-Learning Report. Y.

Prensky, M. (2006). *Don't bother me Mom--I'm learning!* Paragon House.

Reiners, G. M. (2012). Understanding the differences between Husserl's (Descriptive) and Heidegger's (interpretive) phenomenological research. *Journal of Nursing & Care*, *01*(05). doi:10.4172/2167-1168.1000119

Richardson, L. (1997). *Fields of play: Constructing an academic life*. Rutgers University Press.

Richtel, M. (2011, September 3). Technology in schools faces questions on value. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from

http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/04/technology/technology-in-schools-faces-questions-on-value.html

Roberts, G. (2003). Teaching using the Web: Conceptions and approaches from a phenomenographic perspective. *Instructional Science*, *31*(1-2), 127–150. doi:10.1023/A:1022547619474

Robertson, J. W. (2003). Stepping out of the box: Rethinking the failure of ICT to transform schools. *Journal of Educational Change*, *4*(4), 323–344. doi:10.1023/B:JEDU.0000006047.67433.c5

Roblyer, M. D., McDaniel, M., Webb, M., Herman, J., & Witty, J. V. (2010). Findings on Facebook in higher education: A comparison of college faculty and student uses and perceptions of social networking sites. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *13*(3), 134–140. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.03.002

Romdenh-Romluc, K. (2010). *Routledge philosophy guidebook to Merleau-Ponty and phenomenology of perception* (New Ed.). Routledge.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2004). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Saldana, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage Publications Ltd.

Salem students secretly recorded teachers. (n.d.). *SalemNews.com, Salem, MA*. Retrieved July 27, 2013, from http://www.salemnews.com/local/x300778358/Salem-students-secretly-recorded-teachers

Salvucci, D. D., & Taatgen, N. A. (2010). *The multitasking mind*. Oxford University Press.

Samarco, C. V., & Muzzatti, S. L. (2005). *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: Class, identity, and the working class experience in academe*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Sappey, J., & Relf, S. (2010). Digital technology education and its impact on traditional academic roles and practice. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, *7*(1).

Sartre, J.-P. (1981). *The words: The autobiography of Jean-Paul Sartre*. (B. Frechtman, Trans.) (1st Vintage Books ed.). Vintage Books.

Sartre, J.-P. (1993). *Being and nothingness*. (H. E. Barnes, Trans.). Washington Square Press.

Sartre, J.-P., & Elkaim-Sartre, revised by A. (2004). *The imaginary: A phenomenological psychology of the imagination* (Revised.). Routledge.

Schoenfeld, A. C., & Magnan, R. (1992). Mentor in a manual: Climbing the academic ladder to tenure. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED344536

Schon, D. A. (1984). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action* (1st ed.). Basic Books.

Schor, J. (1991). *The overworked American: The unexpected decline of leisure*. [New York, N.Y.]: Basic Books.

Schumacher, E. F. (1975). *Small is beautiful: Economics as if people mattered*. New York: Harper & Row.

Silverman, D. (2007). *A very short, fairly interesting and reasonably cheap book about qualitative research.* SAGE Publications. 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, CA 91320. Tel: 800-818-7243; Tel: 805-499-9774; Fax: 800-583-2665; e-mail:

order@sagepub.com; Web site: http://www.sagepub.com. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED500409

Smith, P. J. A., Flowers, D. P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research*. Sage Publications Ltd.

Social media in higher education: Teaching in Web 2.0. (2013). Hershey PA: Information Science Reference.

Spector, J. M. (2008). *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology*. Taylor & Francis.

Spiegelberg, E. (Ed.). (1981). *The phenomenological movement: A historical introduction* (3rd rev. and enlarged ed.). Springer.

Steinkuehler, C. A., & Williams, D. (2006). Where everybody knows your (screen) name: Online games as "Third Places." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *11*(4), 885–909. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00300.x

Strauss, A. C., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Sullivan, M., Riger, S., Raja, S., & Stokes, J. P. (1997). Measuring perceptions of the work environment for female faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, *21*(1), 63–78. doi:10.1353/rhe.1997.0015

Surry, D. W., & Land, S. M. (2000). Strategies for motivating higher education faculty to use technology. *Innovations in Education & Training International*, *37*(2), 145–153. doi:10.1080/13558000050034501

Tabata, L., & Johnsrud, L. (2008). The impact of faculty attitudes toward technology, distance education, and innovation. *Research in Higher Education*, *49*(7), 625–646. doi:10.1007/s11162-008-9094-7

Tavani, H. T. (2010). *Ethics and technology: Controversies, questions, and strategies for ethical computing* (3rd ed.). Wiley.

Taylor, R. W. (2002). Pros and cons of online learning – a faculty perspective. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, *26*(1), 24–37. doi:10.1108/03090590210415876

The least stressful jobs of 2013 - Forbes. (n.d.). *Forbes*. Retrieved April 8, 2013, from http://www.forbes.com/sites/susanadams/2013/01/03/the-least-stressful-jobs-of-2013/

Tom, A. R. (1980). Teaching as a moral craft: A metaphor for teaching and teacher education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *10*(3), 317. doi:10.2307/1179618

Toor, R. (2012, July 2). Becoming a "stylish" writer. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Becoming-a-Stylish-Writer/132677/

Unwin, D. (1969). Media and methods; Instructional technology in higher education. McGraw Hill Publishing Company Limited, 330 West 42nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10036 ($8.95). Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED055408

Van Manen, M. (2006). Writing qualitatively, or the demands of writing. *Qualitative health research*, *16*(5), 713–722. doi:10.1177/1049732306286911

Van Manen, M. (2002). *Writing in the dark: phenomenological studies in interpretive inquiry*. London, Ont.: Althouse Press.

Van Manen, M., & Adams, C. (2009). The phenomenology of space in writing online. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *41*(1), 10–21. doi:10.1111/j.1469-5812.2008.00480.x

Vandenberg, D. (1971). *Being and education; An essay in existential phenomenology.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Veletsianos, G., & Kimmons, R. (2013). Scholars and faculty members' lived experiences in online social networks. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *16*, 43–50. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2012.01.004

Veletsianos, G., Kimmons, R., & French, K. D. (2013). Instructor experiences with a social networking site in a higher education setting: expectations, frustrations, appropriation, and compartmentalization. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *61*(2), 255–278. doi:10.1007/s11423-012-9284-z

Veletsianos, G., & Miller, C. (2008). Conversing with pedagogical agents: A phenomenological exploration of interacting with digital entities. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *39*(6), 969–986. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00797.x

Waldeck, J. H., Orrego, V. O., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1997). Graduate student/faculty mentoring relationships: Who gets mentored, how it happens, and to what end. *Communication Quarterly*, *45*(3), 93–109. doi:10.1080/01463379709370054

Waltman, J., Bergom, I., Hollenshead, C., Miller, J., & August, L. (2012). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among non-tenure-track faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, *83*(3), 411–434.

Ward, K. A. (2012). *Academic motherhood: how faculty manage work and family*. New Brunswick (N.J.): Rutgers University press.

Wartenberg, T. E. (2008). *Existentialism: A beginner's guide (Beginners Guide*. Oneworld.

Weilenmann, A. (2001). Negotiating use: Making sense of mobile technology. *Personal Ubiquitous Comput.*, *5*(2), 137–145. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/PL00000015

Whitchurch, C. (2010). Some implications of "public/private" space for professional identities in higher education. *Higher Education*, *60*(6), 627–640. doi:10.1007/s10734-010-9320-z

Wieder, B. (2011, March 13). iPads could hinder teaching, professors say. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/iPads-for-College-Classrooms-/126681/

Winter, R. (2009). Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *31*(2), 121–131.

Wolcott, H. F. (2002). *Sneaky kid and its aftermath: Ethics and intimacy in fieldwork*. AltaMira Press.

Wolcott, H. F. (2008). *Ethnography: A way of seeing* (Second Edition.). Altamira Press.

Woolf, V., Bell, A. O., Bell, Q., & McNeillie, A. (1977). *The diary of Virginia Woolf*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company.

Wright, D. (2013). Communication and cultural change in university technology transfer. *Journal of Technical Writing & Communication*, *43*(1), 79–101.

Young, J. R. (1997). More colleges charge students a separate fee for technology. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *43*(40), A24.

Zachary, L. J. (2000). *The mentor's guide: Facilitating effective learning relationships*. John Wiley & Sons.

Zahavi, D. (2003). *Husserl's phenomenology* (1st ed.). Stanford University Press.

Zuga, K. (1997). An analysis of technology education in the United States based upon an historical overview and review of contemporary curriculum research. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, *7*(3), 203–217. doi:10.1023/A:1008856517112